

# Christian Order

## Summary of Contents for October, 1988

ECCLESIA DEI: APOSTOLIC LETTER *Pope John Paul II*

TURN OF THE TIDE *W. J. Quirk*

TRADITIONALIST CHARTER *The Editor*

RENEW AND YOU *Father T. Fitzpatrick*

TWO CLARIFICATIONS: COMMUNION IN  
THE HAND AND EXTRAORDINARY  
MINISTERS *Roman Curia*

LITURGY AND CHURCH MUSIC *Cardinal Ratzinger*

DRIFT AWAY FROM THE FAITH *The Editor*

## APOLOGIES

are due to all our readers for the greatly delayed arrival of the August/September number of *Christian Order*. Due in the days that enclosed the end of August and the beginning of September, it has not yet arrived by today, which is the 16th of September. I can only hope that it will appear within the next few days. I need not inform you that the strike has cost me money. I would ask readers to be so very kind as to send in subscriptions that were due in September (and those few that still remain to be paid in July and August) *without any delay*. Your prompt response to this appeal would be the very greatest help. And, whilst I am at it, will those who have received reminders in October that their subscriptions are due *please* be extra quick in sending them in. I would be so very grateful if you would do this. Thank you and God bless you.

— *Paul Crane, S.J.*

## Contents

### Page

450 TRADITIONALIST CHARTER  
*The Editor*

453 LITURGY AND CHURCH  
MUSIC *Cardinal Ratzinger*

472 EVANGELIZATION: WHAT  
DOES IT MEAN?  
*Fr. T. Mahoney*

474 ECCLESIA DEI: APOSTOLIC  
LETTER *Pope John Paul II*

478 TURN OF THE TIDE?  
*W. J. Quirk*

482 DRIFT AWAY FROM  
THE FAITH *The Editor*

490 RENEW AND YOU  
*Fr. T. Fitzpatrick*

495 LANGUAGE-ORIGINS AND  
EVOLUTION *D. Tassot*

502 TWO CLARIFICATIONS:  
COMMUNION IN THE HAND:  
EXTRAORDINARY MINISTERS  
*Roman Curia*

506 BOOK REVIEW:  
TEILHARDIAN MYTH  
*Peter Wilders*

### If You Change Your Address:

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

*Christian Order* is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London S.W.1V, 2BG. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

*Christian Order* is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £5 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$10.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:

U.S.A., Canada

India, etc.—£10, \$20

Australia—£12, \$25

New Zealand—£12, \$25

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

---

VOLUME 29

OCTOBER

No. 10

---

## Traditionalist Charter

THE EDITOR

AT the not inconsiderable risk of seeming to repeat what W. J. Quirk has said and said so well in his article, which follows immediately on Pope John's Paul II's Apostolic Letter, I would like in this Editorial to lay emphasis on certain passages in this Letter that the Holy Father has written on July 2nd of this year and in which, as I see it, he has in mind so many of the Faithful, who remain devoted to and long for the restoration of what they know as the Tridentine Mass, along with those age-old devotions associated with it.

In the paragraph of his Apostolic Letter that immediately precedes its 6th Section, Pope John Paul II writes :

"To all those Catholic Faithful who feel attached to some previous liturgical and disciplinary forms of the Latin tradition I wish to manifest my will to facilitate their ecclesial communion by means of the necessary measures to guarantee respect for their *rightful aspirations* (italics mine—Ed.). In this matter I ask for the support of the bishops and of all those engaged in the pastoral ministry of the Church".

Immediately, it seems to me, we can see in this passage strong grounds for hope in that there is no reason now why—whatever the opposition encountered in the past—we who love the Tridentine Mass and the old and well-tried devotions that went with it, should accept the role of

unwanted outcasts which, too often in the past, has been allotted to us. That role was never truly ours. The Holy Father, in this letter, assures us of this, at least by implication, when he speaks, in the passage cited above, of his wish "to manifest my will to facilitate their ecclesial communion by means of the necessary measures to guarantee respect for their rightful aspirations". And he proceeds immediately to ask for the support of the bishops and all those engaged in the Church's pastoral ministry in the task he has laid on himself of taking the measures to "guarantee respect" for the "rightful aspirations" of those many of the Catholic Faithful who remain attached to some "previous liturgical and disciplinary forms of the Latin tradition".

If words mean anything at all, the meaning of these words of the Pope are clear: the task of local and pastoral Authority within the Catholic Church is not to hinder, but to help those of the Faithful who are pressing and praying for the restoration of the Tridentine Mass and the age-old liturgical devotions associated with it. Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament comes at once to mind, along with many others.

Note very closely that in Section 6 of his Apostolic Letter, "by virtue of my Apostolic Authority I decree the following". Here he is issuing a command, which is not to be taken lightly by anyone subject to that command. He then goes on in sub-section c) of the same Section 6 to write:

c) "moreover, respect must everywhere be shown for the feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition, *by a wide and generous application of the directives* (italics mine—Ed.) already issued some time ago by the Apostolic See, for the use of the Roman Missal according to the typical edition of 1962".

The inference that that can be drawn legitimately from this passage is that where and when requested by the Faithful, the restoration of the Tridentine Mass, according to the terms of the Indult of October 3rd, 1984 should receive at the hands of local episcopal and pastoral Authority "wide and generous" support. In other words, a

reverse of the previous situation which followed the initial publication of the Indult in October, 1984. It is no secret that, then, the Holy Father's wishes in the matter of the restoration of the Tridentine Mass were hindered rather than helped by local episcopal and pastoral Authority. In consequence, the Indult itself, in practice, became something of a dead letter. Now a reverse of previous attitudes is not merely called for but *commanded* by Pope John Paul II: his mind, most clearly, is that local Church Authority of whatever sort should help and support, rather than hinder and block the process of restoration that he has in mind.

It is the task of the laity now, with respect but with great firmness, backed by prayer, to press without ceasing for the restoration in their own parish and diocese for the restoration of the Tridentine Mass, according to the Indult of October, 1984, and the age-old liturgical devotions associated with it. Now is the acceptable time. It is essential that we put it to the best possible use. We do so the more readily in the knowledge that in our striving we have the unflagging support of the Holy Father. He has given us our Charter. It is for us to hoist it high.

**CORPUS CHRISTI CHURCH,  
MAIDEN LANE, STRAND,  
LONDON, W.C.2.**

**EVERY MONDAY**

**TRIDENTINE MASS AT 5.45 P.M.**

**Preceded by**

**ROSARY & BENEDICTION AT 5.15 P.M.**

I have read twice and very carefully this keynote Address delivered by Cardinal Ratzinger before an audience of 800 at the 8th International Church Music Congress in the Augustinianum at Rome on November 17th, 1985. I can say with complete honesty that I consider it magnificent. In article form one of the most enlightening pieces of prose that I have ever been privileged to read. Despite its title, which could be misleading for some, readers will find here the answers to many basic questions that, during past years, they have found running in and out of their minds. They are asked to read this article with great care and attention. Having done so, I think they will realise that they have found a treasure.

# Liturgy and Church Music

JOSEPH CARDINAL RATZINGER

FROM the very beginning, liturgy and music have been quite closely related. Mere words do not suffice when man praises God. Discourse with God goes beyond the boundaries of human speech. Hence by her very nature the liturgy has everywhere called upon the help of music, of singing, and of the voices of creation in the sounds of instruments. The praise of God, after all, does not involve only man. To worship God means to join in that of which all creatures speak.

Though liturgy and music are by their very nature so closely linked with each other, their relationship has always been a difficult one as well, above all in times of cultural change and at turning points in history. It is thus no surprise that, today, the question of the right form of music in worship is once again disputed. The debates of the last Council and the years immediately following it seemed to

center solely upon the antithesis between the men of pastoral practice and the church musicians who refused to submit to classification in categories of mere pastoral expediency, but strove instead to assert the validity of music's inner worthiness as a pastoral and liturgical standard with a rank of its own. In other words, at bottom the debate seemed limited to the level of concrete application. In the meantime, however, the rift goes much deeper. The second wave of liturgical reform stimulates a questioning of the very principles themselves. It is a question here of the very essence of worship activity as such, of its anthropological and theological foundations. The dispute about church music is symptomatic of a more profound question: what is worship?

## 1. OUTSTRIPPING THE COUNCIL? A NEW CONCEPTION OF THE LITURGY

The new phase of liturgical reform efforts is explicitly based upon its "spirit". As symptomatic of this view I shall use here the informative and clearly conceived article on "Song and Music in the Church" which appeared in the *New Dictionary of the Liturgy* (*Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia*). There, the high artistic rank of Georgian chant and classical polyphony is not called into question. It is not even a case of playing off community activity against elitist art. Indeed, the rejection of a historicist rigidity which merely copies the Past and thus lacks both a Present and a Future, is not the real point at issue, either. It is rather a question of a new basic understanding of liturgy, with which the Council, whose Liturgy Constitution is said to contain a split personality, is to be outstripped.

### **Part more important than whole**

Let us attempt to familiarize ourselves briefly with the basic outlines of this new conception. The point of departure for the liturgy (so we are told) lies in the assembly of two or three who gather in Christ's name. At first hearing, this reference to the promise of Jesus in Matt. 16 : 20 sounds harmless and quite traditional. However, it acquires

a revolutionary impetus through the isolation of this one biblical text, which is viewed in contrast to the entire liturgical tradition. The "two or three" are now set up as the antithesis of an institution with institutional roles, as the antithesis of any kind of "codified program". This definition of the liturgy therefore means that it is not the Church which takes precedence of the group, but rather that the group is more important than the Church. It is not the Church as total entity which supports the liturgy of an individual group or congregation, but rather the group itself is the point at which liturgy begins in every instance. Hence it also follows that liturgy does not grow out of a model shared in common, out of a "rite" (which as a "codified program" now becomes a negative image of constraint); liturgy rather arises on the spot, out of the creativity of those assembled. In such a sociological view, the sacrament of priestly ordination appears as an institutional role which has created a monopoly for itself and which by means of the institution (the Church) undoes the pristine unity and community of the group. In this constellation, we are told, both music and the Latin tongue have become a language of the initiates, "the language of another Church, namely of the institution and of its clergy".

It is evident that the isolation of Matt. 16:20 from the entire Biblical and ecclesiastical tradition of the Church's common prayer has far-reaching consequences: the Lord's promise to those praying anywhere is transformed into the dogma of the autonomous group. The joint action of praying has been intensified to an egalitarianism which regards the development of spiritual offices as the beginning of a different Church. From this point of view, any guiding postulates derived from the Church as a whole are restraints which must be resisted for the sake of the originality and freedom of the liturgical celebration. It is not obedience to a totality but rather the creativity of the moment which becomes determinative.

Plainly, with the acceptance of sociological terminology certain evaluations have also been accepted here: the value system formed by sociological language builds a new view of past and present, negative and positive. And so, conventional (indeed, even conciliar!) terms like the

“treasury of sacred music”, the “organ as queen of instruments”, or the “universality of Gregorian chant” now appear as “mystifications” whose purpose is “to preserve a particular form of power”. A certain administration of power (so we are told) feels threatened by the process of cultural change. It (allegedly) reacts by masking its effort at self-preservation in the guise of love for tradition. Gregorian chant and Palestrina are said to be the tutelary deities of a mythicized ancient reperatory, ingredients of a Catholic counter-culture supported by re-mythicized and super-sacralized archetypes. In fact, the entire historical liturgy of the Church is claimed to be more concerned with the representation of a cultic bureaucracy than with the singing activity of the congregation. And finally, the content of Pope St. Pius X’s *Motu Proprio* on church music is called a “culturally shortsighted and theologically worthless ideology of sacred music”.

### “Spirit” of Council = creativity

Now of course it is not only sociologism which is at work here, but also a complete separation of the New Testament from the Church’s history, linked to a theory of decadence which is quite typical of many an Enlightenment situation: real purity can only be found in the “Jesuistic” origins, and all the rest of history seems to be a “musical adventure with false and disoriented experiences”. This history must now “be brought to an end” in order to begin again with what is right.

But just what does the New and Better look like? The basic ideas have already been hinted at earlier, and we must now try to render them more concrete. Two fundamental values are stated quite clearly. The “primary value” of a renewed liturgy, so we are told, is “the activity of all persons in fullness and in authenticity”. Accordingly, church music primarily means that the “people of God” depicts its own identity by singing. And with this, we arrive at the second value decision which is operative here: music proves to be a force which causes the group to cohere. The familiar songs are, so to speak, the hallmarks of a community. From these two principles there follow

the main categories of music at worship: project, program, animation, management. The How, so we are told, is much more important than the What. The ability to celebrate is claimed to be primarily "the ability to produce": music must above all be "produced" or "made". . . . In order to be fair, I must add that the article shows complete appreciation for different cultural situations and leaves room for the acceptance of historical materials as well. And above all the articles stresses the paschal character of Christian liturgy, whose song not only depicts the identity of the People of God, but should also render an account of its hope and proclaim to all the countenance of the Father of Jesus Christ.

In spite of the great rupture, there thus remains elements which make dialogue feasible and offer the hope that unity in our basic understanding of the liturgy can once again be achieved. Because the liturgy is derived from the group instead of from the Church, this unity threatens to disappear, and that not merely in theory, but in actual liturgical practice.

I would not speak at such length about all of this if I believed that such ideas were attributable only to a few individual theorists. Although it is beyond all dispute that they are not supported by the texts of Vatican Two, many a liturgical office and its organs firmly believes that the "spirit" of the Council points in this direction. In the sense of what has been described above, an all too widespread opinion today holds that the real categories of the conciliar understanding of liturgy are a so-called creativity, the activity of all those present, and the reference to a group whose members know and are drawn to each other. Not only assistant pastors, but sometimes even bishops have the feeling that they are not loyal to the Council if they celebrate Holy Mass exactly as it is printed in the *Missale*: at least one "creative" formula must be slipped in, no matter how banal it might be. Of course, the bourgeois greeting of the audience and if possible also the friendly greetings at leavetaking have already become an obligatory element of the sacred action which scarcely anyone dares to omit.

## 2. THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THIS CONCEPTION AND ITS QUESTIONABLE ASPECTS

In spite of all that has been said thus far, we have not yet reached the center of this change in values. The points already discussed all follow from the preferential ranking of the group above the Church. How so? Because the Church is classified under the general terms "institution", and in the type of sociology being borrowed here, "institution" bears the quality of a negative value. "Institution" embodies power, and power is viewed as the antithesis of freedom. Since faith ("imitation of Jesus") is conceived of as a positive value, it must stand on the side of freedom and hence by its very nature be anti-institutional as well. Accordingly, worship may not be a prop for or a part of an institution either, but it must instead be a counterforce which helps bring down the mighty from their thrones.

If that be the point of departure, then of course the Paschal hope (to which the liturgy is supposed to testify) can become quite terrestrial. It can become the hope of overcoming the institutions, and in fact it becomes a weapon in the struggle against the powers that be. For example, he who merely reads the texts of the *Missa Nicaraguensis* can get a good idea of this shifting of hope and of the new realism which liturgy acquires here, as instrument of a militant promise. And something else becomes evident: the importance which actually accrues to music in the new conception. The revolutionary songs have the power to arouse, and this communicates an enthusiasm and a conviction which a merely spoken liturgy could not evoke. Here, there is no longer any opposition to liturgical music, since music has received a new and indispensable function of arousing irrational powers and a communitarian impulse which is the purpose of the entire process. And music simultaneously contributes to the formation of consciousness, because something which is sung gradually communicates itself to the spirit much more effectively than something merely spoken or thought. Moreover, by way of the group liturgy the boundaries of the locally assembled community are here quite deliberately overstepped: by means of the liturgical form

and its music there arises a new solidarity which is supposed to bring forth a new people that calls itself the people of God, although "God" really means the people themselves and the historical energies realized in them.

Let us now return to our analysis of the values which have become determinate of the new liturgical consciousness. First of all, there is the negative quality of the concept "institution" and the fact that the Church is considered solely under this sociological aspect, which is not that of an empirical sociology (be it noted), but from a point of view for which we are indebted to the so-called masters of distrust. They have obviously done their work quite well, and have achieved a mind-set which remains effective even when its origin goes undermarked. But the distrust could not have had such explosive power if it were not accompanied by a promise whose fascination is almost unavoidable: the idea of freedom as the real requirement of human dignity. To this extent the question of the correct concept of freedom must represent the heart of the discussion. And thereby the dispute about the liturgy is brought back from all the superficial questions about its shape, to the real matter at hand, for the liturgy it is actually a matter of the presence of the Redemption and of the approach to genuine freedom. The positive side of the new dispute is undoubtedly to be found in thus pointing up the central issue.

At the same time, we can see just what Catholic Christianity is suffering from today. If the Church appears to be merely an institution, a bearer of power and thus an opponent of freedom and a hindrance to redemption, then the faith lives in contradiction to itself, because on the one hand faith cannot dispense with the Church, and on the other hand faith is fundamentally opposed to the Church. Therein lies the tragic paradox of this trend in liturgical reform. After all, liturgy without the Church is a contradiction in terms. Where all are active so that all become themselves the subject the real agent in the liturgy disappears along with the common subject "Church". People forget that the liturgy is supposed to be *opus Dei*, God's work, in which he himself acts first, and we become the redeemed precisely because he is at work. The group celebrates itself, and in so doing the group is no reason for

celebrating. This is why universal activity leads to boredom. Nothing at all happens without him whom the whole world awaits. Only in light of this fact is the transition to more concrete purposes, as they are reflected in the *Missa Nicaraguensis*, a logical conclusion.

### **“Institution”— a NO-NO**

Hence the representatives of this view must be asked with all firmness: Is the Church really just an institution, a cultic bureaucracy, a power apparatus? Is the spiritual office (of Holy Orders) merely the monopolization of sacred prerogatives? If it proves impossible to overcome these ideas at the level of the emotions as well, and to view the Church once again from the heart in a different light, then we will not be renewing liturgy, but the dead will be burying the dead and calling it “reform”. And then, of course, *church* music no longer exists either, because it has lost its subject, the Church. In fact, in such a case one could no longer correctly speak of liturgy at all, because liturgy presupposes the Church, and what would remain are mere group rituals which use musical means of expression more or less adroitly. If liturgy is to survive or indeed be renewed, it is essential that the Church be discovered anew. And I would add: if man’s alienation is to be overcome and if he is to re-discover his identity, then it is obligatory that man re-discover the Church, which is not an institution inimical to humanity, but that new We in which alone the individual can achieve his stability and his permanence.

In this connection it would be salutary indeed to re-study with all thoroughness the small book with which Romano Guardini, the great pioneer of the liturgical renewal, concluded his literary activity in the year the Council ended. He himself stressed that he wrote this book out of concern and love for the Church, whose human side—and its parlous state — he knew quite well. But he had learned to discover in the Church’s human frailty the scandal of God’s Incarnation; he had learned to see in the Church the presence of the Lord who had made the Church his Body.

Only when that is accomplished, does Jesus Christ synchronize or co-exist with us. Without this, there is no real

liturgy, which is not a mere recalling of the Paschal mystery but its true presence. And again, only when this is the case, is liturgy a sharing in the Tridentine dialogue between Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Only in this way is liturgy not our "making" but the *opus Dei* — God's action upon and with us. Therefore Guardini emphatically stressed that, in the liturgy, it was not a matter of *doing* something, but of *being*. The idea that general activity is the central value of the liturgy is the most complete antithesis to Guardini's liturgical conception which one could imagine. The truth is that the general activity of all is not simply *not* the liturgy's basic value: it is as such no value at all.

### General activity of no value

I shall forego any further discussion of this question for we must concentrate upon finding a point of departure and a standard for the correct relationship between liturgy and music. As a matter of fact, even from this point of view far-reaching consequences flow from establishing the fact that the Church is the real subject of the liturgy — the Church as the *communio Sanctorum* of all places and of all times. From this there follows (as Guardini exhaustively showed in his early work *Liturgical Formation*) not merely the withdrawal of the liturgy from the arbitrariness of the group and of the individual (even though he be cleric or specialist) which Guardini termed the objectivity and the positive nature of the liturgy. Above all, there follow the three ontological dimensions in which the liturgy lives: the cosmos, history, and the *mysterium*. The connection with history includes development meaning that liturgy is part of something living, something which has a beginning, which continues to exert its influence and which remains present without being completed, but rather lives only by being further developed. Some elements die off, others are forgotten and return later on in a different way, but development always implies partaking of an open-ended beginning.

And this brings us to a second category which is especially important because it is related to the cosmos: liturgy so conceived exists basically as partaking. No one is the

first and only creator of liturgy. For everyone, liturgy is participation in something larger, which goes beyond the mere individual. And in this way each individual is also an agent, active precisely because he is a recipient.

### **Liturgy lives by being developed**

Finally, relationship to the mystery means that the beginning of the liturgical event never lies within ourselves. It is rather response to an initiative from above, to a call and an act of love, which need to be explained. But the mystery does not open itself to explanation. It becomes accessible only by being accepted, in the "Yes" which even today we can safely call obedience, in a biblical sense.

And this brings us to a point which is very important for the onset of art. Group liturgy is not cosmic, since it lives from the autonomy of the group. Group liturgy has no history, for it is characterized precisely by emancipation from history and by a "do-it-yourself" attitude, even when a group uses movable scenery borrowed from history. And group liturgy knows nothing of the mystery, for in group liturgy everything is explained and must be explained. That is why development and partaking are just as foreign to group liturgy as is obedience, which perceives a meaning greater than that which can be explained.

All of this is now replaced by creativity, in which the autonomy of those emancipated attempts to corroborate or ratify itself. Such a creativity, which aspires to be a functional expression of autonomy and emancipation, is — precisely on that account — diametrically opposed to any form of partaking. Characteristic of this creativity is arbitrariness as a necessary expression of the rejection of all prescribed forms or rules, unrepeatability because repetition would already imply dependence, and artificiality because it is necessarily a case of purely human production. And so we see that human creativity which refuses to receive and to partake is contradictory and untrue in its very nature, because man can only be man through receiving and partaking. Such creativity is escape from the *conditio humana* and therefore falsehood. This is ultimately why cultural decadence begins at the point where along with the loss

of faith in God a pre-established reasonableness of being must also be called into question.

Let us now summarize our findings so that we can draw consequences for the point of departure and the basic form of church music. It has become evident that the primacy of the group derives from an understanding of the Church as institution based upon a concept of freedom which is incompatible with the idea and the reality of the Institutional. Indeed, this idea of freedom is no longer capable of grasping the dimension of the *mysterium* in the reality of the Church. Freedom is conceived in terms of autonomy and emancipation, and takes concrete shape in the idea of creativity, which against this background is the exact opposite of that objectivity and positiveness which belongs to the essence of the Church's liturgy. The group is truly free only when it discovers itself anew each time.

We also found that liturgy worthy of the name is the radical antithesis of all this. Genuine liturgy is opposed to an historical arbitrariness which knows no development and hence is ultimately vacuous. Genuine liturgy is also opposed to an unrepeatability which is also exclusivity and loss of communication without regard for any groupings. Genuine liturgy is not opposed to the technical, but to the artificial in which man creates a counter-world for himself and loses sight of, indeed loses a feeling for, God's creation. The antitheses are evident, as is the incipient clarification of the inner justification for group thinking as an autonomistically conceived idea of freedom. But now we must inquire positively as to the anthropological concept which forms the basis for the liturgy in the sense of the Church's faith.

### 3. THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL PATTERN OF THE CHURCH'S LITURGY

The answer to our question is suggested by two fundamental statements in the New Testament. St. Paul coined the expression *logikē latreia* in Rom. 12:1, but this is very difficult to translate because we lack a satisfactory equivalent for the concept of *logos*. It might perhaps be translated "logos-like worship" or "worship fixed or determined by the Spirit", which would also echo Jesus' statement

about adoration in spirit and in truth (John 4:23). But it is also possible to translate "adoration stamped or marked by the word", adding of course that in a biblical sense (as well as in the Greek meaning) "word" is more than mere speech or language: it is creative reality. To be sure, it is also more than mere thought or spirit: it is spirit which explains and communicates itself. The relationship to a text, the rationality, the intelligibility and the sobriety of Christian liturgy have always been deduced from this fact and presupposed as the basic norm of liturgical music. But it would be a restrictive and a false interpretation to understand this norm as strictly requiring of all liturgical music a very close link with the text, or to declare the intelligibility of the text to be a general requirement for all liturgical music. After all, "word" in the Biblical sense is more than "text", and comprehension includes more than the banal perspicuity of what is obvious to everyone, what is to be compressed into the most superficial rationality. It is quite correct, however, that music which serves the adoration "in spirit and in the truth" cannot be rhythmic ecstasy, sensual suggestion or stupefaction, subjective emotional bliss, or superficial entertainment. It is rather subordinated to a message, to a comprehensive spiritual statement which is rational in the highest sense of the word. In other words, it is quite correct to say that such music corresponds in its innermost nature to this "word" in a comprehensive sense, indeed must serve it.

And so we are quite naturally led to another text which makes the really fundamental biblical statement about worship by clarifying for us the importance of the "word" and its relationship to us. I refer to that sentence in the prologue of St. John's Gospel: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory" (John 1:14). First of all, the "word" to which Christian worship refers, is not a text, but living reality: a God who is Meaning communicating itself and who communicates himself by becoming man. This Incarnation is now the holy tent or tabernacle, the point of reference for all cult, which is a gazing upon God's glory and does him honor. But these statements of St. John's Prologue do not convey the complete picture. The passage will be misunderstood unless

we take them together with the "farewell speeches" of Jesus, in which he says to his disciples, "If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again. I go away, and I come unto you. It is expedient to you that I go, for if I go not, the Paraclete will not come to you" (John 12:2 ff.; 14:18 ff.; 16:5 ff. etc). The Incarnation is only the first step in a longer process which moves to a final and meaningful conclusion in the Cross and the Resurrection. From the Cross, the Lord draws everything to himself and bears what is corporal, i.e., man and the whole created world, into God's eternity.

### **Subordinate to the message**

The liturgy is subordinate to this movement, which we might call the basic text to which all liturgical music refers; music must be measured from within by the standard of this line of motion. Liturgical music is a result of the demands and of the dynamism of the Incarnation of the Word, for music means that even among us, the word cannot be mere speech. The principal ways in which the Incarnation continues to operate are of course the sacramental signs themselves. But they are quite misplaced if they are not immersed in a liturgy which as a whole follows this expansion of the Word into the corporal and into the sphere of all our senses. It is this fact which justifies and indeed renders necessary images, in complete contrast to Jewish and Islamic types of worship. This is also the reason why it is necessary to appeal to those deeper levels of comprehension and response which becomes accessible through music. Faith becoming music is part of the process of the Word becoming flesh. But at the same time, this "becoming music" is also subordinated in a unique way to that inner evolution of the Incarnation event which I tried to hint at earlier: the Word become flesh comes to be; in the Cross and Resurrection, flesh become Word. Both are permeated with each other. The Incarnation is not revoked, but becomes definitive at that instant in which the movement turns around, so to speak: flesh itself becomes Word, is "logocized", but precisely this transformation brings about a new unity of all reality which was obviously so important to God that he paid for it at the price of the Son's Cross.

When the Word becomes music, there is involved on the one hand perceptible illustration, incarnation or taking on flesh, attraction of pre-rational and supra-rational powers, a drawing upon the hidden resonance of creation, a discovery of the song which lies at the basis of all things. And so this becoming music is itself the very turning point in the movement: it involves not only the Word becoming flesh, but simultaneously the flesh becoming spirit. Brass and wood become sound; what is unconscious and unsettled becomes orderly and meaningful resonance. What takes place is an embodiment or incarnation which is spiritualization, and a spiritualization which is incarnation or em-“body”-ment is always simultaneously spiritualization, and Christian spiritualization is em-“body”-ment into the body of the *Logos* become man.

#### 4. THE CONSEQUENCES FOR LITURGICAL MUSIC

##### a) *Basic principles*

To the degree that in music this conjunction of both movements takes place, music serves in the highest degree and in an irreplaceable manner that interior exodus which liturgy always is and wants to be. This means that the propriety of liturgical music is measured by its inner conformity to the basic anthropological and theological model. At first glance, such a statement seems far removed from concrete musical realities. But the statement becomes very concrete indeed when we consider the antithetical models of cultic music which I mentioned earlier. Or we can recall the Dionysiac type of religion and its music, which Plato discussed on the basis of his religious and philosophical views. In many forms of religion, music is associated with frenzy and ecstasy. The free expansion of human existence, toward which man's own hunger for the Infinite is directed, is supposed to be achieved through sacred delirium induced by frenzied instrumental rhythms. Such music lowers the barriers of individuality and personality, and in it man liberates himself from the burden of consciousness. Music becomes ecstasy, liberation from the ego, amalgamation with the universe.

Today we experience the secularized variation of this type in rock and pop music, whose festivals are an anti-

cult with the same tendency: desire for destruction, repealing the limitations of the everyday, and the illusion of salvation in liberation from the ego, in the wild ecstasy of a tumultuous crowd. These are measures which involve a form of release related to that achieved through drugs. It is the complete antithesis of Christian faith in the Redemption. Accordingly, it is only logical that in this area diabolical cults and demonic musics are on the increase today, and their dangerous power of deliberately destroying personality is not yet taken seriously enough. The dispute between Dionysiac and Apolline music which Plato tried to arbitrate, is not our concern, since Apollo is not Christ. But the question which Plato posed concerns us in a most significant way.

In a way which we could not imagine thirty years ago, music has become the decisive vehicle of a counter-religion and thus calls for a parting of the ways. Since rock music seeks release through liberation from the personality and its responsibility, it can be on the one hand precisely classified among the anarchic ideas of freedom which today predominate more openly in the West than in the East. But that is precisely why rock music is so completely antithetical to the Christian concept of redemption and freedom, indeed its exact opposite. Hence music of this type must be excluded from the Church on principle, and not merely for aesthetic reasons, or because of restorative crankiness or historical inflexibility.

### **Music associated with frenzy**

If we were to continue our analysis of the anthropological foundations of various types of music, we could render our question even more concrete. There is an agitational type of music which animates men for various collective goals. There is a sensuous type of music which brings man into the realm of the erotic or in some other way essentially tends toward feelings of sensual desire. There is a purely entertaining type of music which desires to express nothing more than an interruption of silence. And there is a rationalistic type of music in which the tones only serve rational constructs, and in which there is no real penetration of spirit and senses. Many dry catechism

hymns and many modern songs constructed by committees belong to this category. Music truly appropriate to the worship of the incarnate Lord exalted on the cross exists on the strength of a different, a greater, a much more truly comprehensive synthesis of spirit, intuition and audible sound. We might say that Western music derives from the inner richness of this synthesis, indeed has developed and unfolded it in a fulness of possibilities ranging from Gregorian chant and the music of the cathedrals via the great polyphony and the music of the Renaissance and the Baroque up to Bruckner and beyond. This pre-eminence is found only in the West because it could arise only out of an anthropological foundation which unites the spiritual and the profane in an ultimate human unity. And the pre-eminence disappears to the degree that this anthropology vanishes. For me, the greatness of this music is the most obvious and immediate verification of the Christian faith in the Redemption which could be found. Those who are truly impressed by this grandeur somehow realize from their innermost depths that the faith is true, even though they may need to travel some distance in order to carry out this insight with deliberate understanding.

### **Union of spiritual and profane**

This means that the Church's liturgical music must be adjoined to that integration of human existence which we encounter through faith in the Incarnation. Such redeeming release is more toilsome than that sought in ecstatic frenzy, but this toil is the exertion of truth itself. On the one hand, it must integrate the senses into the spirit, in accord with the impulse of the "Sursum corda". Pure spiritualization, however, is not the goal, but rather integration of the sensitive powers with spirit, so that both taken together become the complete person. The spirit is not degraded by taking in the sense faculties, but actually receives thereby the complete richness of creation. And on the other hand, the senses are not rendered less real when they are permeated with the spirit, because thereby they participate in the spirit's infinitude. Every sensuous desire is really quite limited and ultimately incapable of intensification because an act of the senses cannot go be-

yond a certain limit. Those who expect release from an act of the senses will be disappointed, or "frustrated" as we say today. By being integrated into the spirit, the senses receive a new depth and reach into the endlessness of the spiritual adventure. Only there do they recover themselves completely—on condition, of course, that the spirit too does not remain uncommunicative. In "lifting up your hearts"—*Sursum Corda*—music of faith seeks the integration of man, and finds it not within itself, but only by going beyond itself into the Word made flesh. Sacred music which forms a part of this framework of movement thus becomes man's purification, his ascent. Let us remember, though, that this music is not the product of a moment but participation in history. It cannot be realized by an individual, but only in cooperation with others. And thus such a sacred music also expresses entrance into the history of faith, and the mutual relationship of all members of Christ's body. Such a sacred music bequeathes joy and a higher type of ecstasy which does not extinguish personality, but unites and thus liberates. Such a sacred music gives us a foretaste of that freedom which does not destroy, but which unites and purifies.

*b) Remarks on the Present Situation*

The musician, of course, will ask: How can that be accomplished? In the last analysis, great works of church music can only be bestowed or presented, since it is a matter of going beyond oneself, which is something man cannot accomplish without help, whereas according to the well-known mechanisms of stupefaction, frenzy of the senses is producible. But all producing ends where the truly Great begins. It is this limitation which we must first of all recognize and acknowledge. To that extent, the beginnings of great sacred music necessarily lie in reverence, in receptivity, and in that humility which is prepared to serve and to minister while partaking of already existing greatness. It is only the person who at the very least lives radically within the inner framework of this image of man, who can create the music appropriate to it.

The Church has posted two additional signposts. In its inner character, liturgical music must fulfill the demands

of the great liturgical texts, of the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei. This by no means implies that it should be strictly limited to expressing the text, as I mentioned earlier. But in the inner direction of these texts, liturgical music finds a guideline for its own statement. And the other signpost is the reference to Gregorian chant and Palestrina. This too does not imply that all church music must be an imitation of such music. In this respect, there was actually many a restriction in the church music renewal during the 19th century as well as in the papal documents based upon it. Correctly understood, the reference to Gregorian chant and Palestrina simply means that we find here a standard which provides orientation. But the results of creativity applying and transforming such orientation cannot of course be determined in advance. One question remains. Humanly speaking, can we hope that new creative possibilities are still open here? And how is that to come about? The first part of the question is actually easy to answer, because if this concept of man is inexhaustible in contrast to the other one, then it also opens up continually new possibilities for artistic expression in proportion to the degree to which it vivifies the spirit of an age. And therein lies the difficulty for the second part of the question. In our own time, the faith has to a great extent receded as a public formative force. How is the faith supposed to become creative? Has it not been forced back on all fronts into the position of a mere subculture?

### **Silence, bellowing, and singing**

By way of reply, we might say that in Africa, Asia and Latin America we are apparently on the threshold of a new florescence of the faith which could also give rise to new cultural forms. But even in the Western world, we should not be frightened by the term "subculture". In the cultural crisis we are currently experiencing, new cultural purification and unification can break forth only from islands of spiritual composure. It is already apparent that Christian culture forms itself anew wherever new departures of faith occur, and that joint experience inspires and opens new paths which we could not previously see. However, J. F.

Doppelbauer has quite rightly pointed out that genuine liturgical music often and not by accident bears the traits of later or mature work and presupposes that growth and ripening have taken place earlier. Here it is important that there exists the "antechambers" of popular piety and its music as well as religious music in the broader sense, which should always remain in fruitful exchange with liturgical music. On the one hand the "antechambers" will be fructified and purified by liturgical music, while on the other hand they prepare the way for new forms of liturgical music. Out of such freer forms there can develop elements capable of entering the joint action of the Church's universal worship. Here, too, is the realm in which the group can try out its creativity, in the hope that one day something will emerge which can belong to all.

### *Conclusion: Liturgy, Music and the Cosmos*

I would like to conclude my remarks with a fine quotation from Mahatma Gandhi which I recently found in a calendar. Gandhi mentions the three "living areas" of the cosmos and notes that each of these involves a specific manner of existing. Fish live in the sea, and they are silent. Animals on earth below, bark and bray. But the birds who inhabit the heavens — they sing. Silence is proper to the sea; braying is proper to the earth; and singing belongs to heaven. But man has a share in all three, for within himself he bears the depths of the sea, the burden of the earth and the heights of heaven. Hence he possesses all three properties: silence, bellowing and singing.

Today, I would like to add, we see that for man deprived of transcendence there remains only braying, because he desires to be earth and nothing more, indeed tries to make the heavens and the ocean deep to be his earth. True liturgy, the liturgy of the communion of saints, gives man once again his completeness. It instructs him once again in silence and in singing by opening for him the depths of the sea and by teaching him to fly — the existence of the angels. By "lifting up the heart", true liturgy allows the buried song to resound in man once again.

# Points at Issue

## EVANGELIZATION: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

FR. THOMAS O'MAHONY

**T**HREE is a tendency today to identify the interests of the church with those of the passing mood. Protestantism has already fallen into this trap and now preaches a travesty of the gospel — the “social gospel” so called.

In the Catholic Church we find nowadays a like tendency among some bishops, priests, religious and laity.

Hence, as Pope Paul VI has so often stated, it cannot be stressed sufficiently that the primary task of the church is to extend through time the work of Christ's redemption and not to turn herself into a vehicle of transient and temporal protest. The contribution which the Catholic Church makes to the world is above all in her redemptive capacity. The rest follows, but only to the extent that she is faithful to the task given her by her founder.

In May of 1969 the World Council of Churches convened a consultation group in England and after five days this group from all nations recommended that the churches support guerrilla fighters struggling against racist regimes. Other recommendations were that the World Council of Churches should instruct members to apply economic sanctions against corporations and institutions that practiced blatant racism, and that governments should be pressed to impose more stringent economic sanctions against nations with policies of racial discrimination. As Bishop Huddleston (Anglican), England recently put it: “The church must identify itself with the movement for revolutionary change in the whole structure of society”. Many Catholic priests endorse this view.

Now, in the light of papal teaching, this kind of doctrine is wrong precisely because it makes the first task of the church a purely temporal mission. By reason of the supernatural origin and destiny of the Catholic Church she is not a follower but a leader of men, and her primary task is to

bring Christ's message to them. She is concerned with the temporal only in so far as it is related to the basic message she brings to mankind.

What would it profit the church if she gained the whole world, but lost her soul in the process? And this is what she would lose if, in her institutional capacity, she committed herself to a temporal cause. She would lose her soul in the sense that she would lose her transcendence and become a prey to competing factions, bandied about by temporal disputes.

It is necessary, then, to distinguish between the church in its institutional capacity and members of the church in their capacity as responsible Christian citizens. It is these latter who, as Vatican II so clearly taught, have the obligation to "restore all things in Christ".

The institutional church of its very nature is limited to the proclamation of general principle and measured protest against particular injustice; but at all stages of political and social life when day-to-day decisions are made affecting all ranges of public life Christian men and women *as individuals* have the duty to influence these decisions. This is their mission: *it is not that of the institutional church*. This is the clear teaching of Vatican II in its Constitution on the Apostolate of the Laity.

Church leaders have the duty to train and encourage *laymen* to take their appropriate place in the forefront of public life at every level of society. This means that church leaders should be, not in the front line, but at the rear encouraging the laity to take front-line positions that rightfully belong to them.

As Cardinal Felici stated in Brazil, July 1969: "Each epoch has its own needs and demands, which cannot be avoided by the Church. But it is not sustainable for the bishop or priest to fit himself to cope with local challenges and situations".

**This Apostolic Letter of Pope John Paul II  
was published in the *Osservatore Romano* on  
July 2nd, 1988 in the immediate aftermath of  
the unlawful consecration of four bishops by  
Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre.**

# Ecclesia Dei

## APOSTOLIC LETTER OF JOHN PAUL II

1. With great affliction the Church has learned of the unlawful episcopal ordination conferred on 30 June last by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, which has frustrated all the efforts made during the previous years to ensure the full communion with the Church of the Priestly Fraternity of St. Pius X founded by the same Mons. Lefebvre. These efforts, especially intense during recent months, in which the Apostolic See has shown comprehension to the limits of the possible, were all to no avail (1).

2. This affliction was particularly felt by the Successor of Peter to whom in the first place pertains the guardianship of the unity of the Church, (2) even though the number of persons directly involved in these events might be few, since every person is loved by God on his own account and has been redeemed by the blood of Christ shed on the Cross for the salvation of all.

The particular circumstances, both objective and subjective in which Archbishop Lefebvre acted, provide everyone with an occasion for profound reflection and for a renewed pledge of fidelity to Christ and to his Church.

3. In itself, this act was one of *disobedience* to the Roman Pontiff in a very grave matter and of supreme importance for the unity of the Church, such as is the ordination of bishops whereby the apostolic succession is sacramentally perpetuated. Hence such disobedience—which implies in practice the rejection of the Roman primacy—constitutes a *schismatic* act. (3) In performing such an act, notwithstanding the formal *canonical warning* sent to them by the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for

Bishops on 17 June last, Mons. Lefebvre and the priests Bernard Fellay, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, Richard Williamson and Alfonso de Galarreta, have incurred the grave penalty of excommunication envisaged by ecclesiastical law. (4)

4. The *root* of this schismatic act can be discerned in an incomplete and contradictory notion of Tradition. Incomplete, because it does not take sufficiently into account the *living* character of Tradition, which, as the Second Vatican Council clearly taught, "comes from the apostles and progresses in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are being passed on. This comes about in various ways. It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. And it comes from the preaching of those who have received, along with their right of succession in the episcopate, the sure charism of truth". (5)

But especially contradictory is a notion of Tradition which opposes the universal Magisterium of the Church possessed by the Bishops of Rome and the Body of Bishops. It is impossible to remain faithful to the Tradition while breaking the ecclesial bond with him to whom, in the person of the Apostle Peter, Christ himself entrusted the ministry of unity in his Church. (6)

5. Faced with the situation that has arisen I deem it my duty to inform all the Catholic faithful of some aspects which this sad event has highlighted.

a) The outcome of the movement promoted by Mons. Lefebvre can and must be, for all the Catholic faithful, a motive for sincere reflection concerning their own fidelity to the Church's Tradition, authentically interpreted by the ecclesiastical Magisterium, ordinary and extraordinary, especially in the Ecumenical Councils from Nicaea to Vatican II. From this reflection all should draw a renewed and efficacious conviction of the necessity of strengthening still more their fidelity by rejecting erroneous interpretations and arbitrary and unauthorized applications in matters of doctrine, liturgy and discipline.

To the bishops especially it pertains, by reason of their pastoral mission, to exercise the important duty of a clear-sighted vigilance full of charity and firmness, so that this fidelity may be everywhere safeguarded. (7)

However, it is necessary that all the Pastors and the other faithful have a new awareness, not only of the lawfulness but also of the richness for the Church of a diversity of charisms, traditions of spirituality and apostolate, which also constitutes the beauty of unity in variety; of that blended "harmony" which the earthly Church raises up to Heaven under the impulse of the Holy Spirit.

b) Moreover, I should like to remind theologians and other experts in the ecclesiastical sciences that they should feel called upon to answer in the present circumstances. Indeed, the extent and depth of the teaching of the Second Vatican Council call for a renewed commitment to deeper study in order to reveal clearly the Council's continuity with Tradition, especially in points of doctrine which, perhaps because they are new, have not yet been well understood by some sections of the Church.

c) In the present circumstances I wish especially to make an appeal both solemn and heartfelt, paternal and fraternal, to all those who until now have been linked in various ways to the movement of Archbishop Lefebvre, that they may fulfil the grave duty of remaining united to the Vicar of Christ in the unity of the Catholic Church, and of ceasing their support in any way for that movement. Everyone should be aware that formal adherence to the schism is a grave offence against God and carries the penalty of excommunication decreed by the Church's law. (8)

To all those Catholic faithful who feel attached to some previous liturgical and disciplinary forms of the Latin tradition I wish to manifest my will to facilitate their ecclesial communion by means of the necessary measures to guarantee respect for their rightful aspirations. In this matter I ask for the support of the bishops and of all those engaged in the pastoral ministry in the Church.

6. Taking account of the importance and complexity of the problems referred to in this document, by virtue of my Apostolic Authority I decree the following:

a) a *Commission* is instituted whose task it will be to collaborate with the bishops, with the Departments of the Roman Curia and with the circles concerned, for the purpose of facilitating full ecclesial communion of priests, seminarians, religious communities or individuals until now linked in various ways to the Fraternity founded by Mons. Lefebvre, who may wish to remain united to the Successor of Peter in the Catholic Church while preserving their spiritual and liturgical traditions, in the light of the Protocol signed on 5 May last by Cardinal Ratzinger and Mons. Lefebvre:

b) this Commission is composed of a Cardinal President and other members of the Roman Curia, in a number that will be deemed opportune according to circumstances;

c) moreover, respect must everywhere be shown for the feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition, by a wide and generous application of the directives already issued some time ago by the Apostolic See, for the use of the Roman Missal according to the typical edition of 1962. (9)

7. As this year specially dedicated to the Blessed Virgin is now drawing to a close, I wish to exhort all to join in unceasing prayer which the Vicar of Christ, through the intercession of the Mother of the Church, addresses to the Father in the very words of the Son: "That they all may be one!".

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, 2 July 1988, the tenth year of the pontificate.

#### *Notes*

1) Cf. "Informatory Note" of 16 June, 1988: *L'Osservatore Romano*, English edition, 27 June, 1988, pp. 1-2.

2) Cf. Vatican Council I, Const. *Pastor Aeternus*, cap. 3: DS 3060.

3) Cf. *Code of Canon Law*, can. 751.

4) Cf. *Code of Canon Law*, can. 1382.

5) Vatican Council II, Const. *Dei Verbum*, n. 8. Cf. Vatican Council I, Const. *Dei Filius*, cap. 4: DS 3020.

6) Cf. Mt 16:18; Lk 10:16; Vatican Council I, Const. *Pastor Aeternus*, cap 3: DS 3060.

7) Cf. *Code of Canon Law*, can. 386; Paul VI, Apost. Exhort. *Quinque iam anni*, 8 Dec., 1970: *AAS* 63 (1971) pp. 97-106.

8) Cf. *Code of Canon Law*, can. 1364.

9) Cf. Congregation for Divine Worship, Letter *Quattuor abhinc annos*, 3 Oct., 1984: *AAS* 76 (1984) pp. 1088-1089.

Mr. Quirk's commentary on the Pope's Apostolic Letter *Ecclesia Dei* is not only extremely sound, but full of well-based and true hope for the return of the Old Mass, at least on a basis of parity of esteem with the New. It should be read with care and attention.

## Turn of the Tide?

W. J. QUIRK

IT is on record that, ten years ago when Pope John Paul received Archbishop Lefebvre in audience, Cardinal Seper intervened in the conversation with the words: "They are making a banner out of the Mass of Pius V". It was interesting, in June 1988, to hear Cardinal Hume, interviewed on television, say the same thing: "They are using the Mass as a banner". And, a few weeks later, the Bishops' liturgical guru, Father Matthews, General Secretary of the Bishops Liturgy Office, in reaction to the first news of the Pope's letter, *Ecclesia Dei* said that he would be cautious about wholesale permission for the Old Mass, because, for many people, it was a rallying point for a particular attitude to Church and Authority. One might with as much, or as little, justification assert that the adamantly negative stand against the Old Rite, so frequently encountered, is based not so much on a deep love of the Novus Ordo as on a particular attitude to Church, to doctrine, to ecumenism, to priesthood.

### *What About Your Fidelity,?*

However, the important point to note now is that all such considerations are suddenly rendered out of date. With the issuing on July 2nd, of this year, 1988 of the Apostolic Letter, *Ecclesia Dei*, the terms of the debate, if debate it can be called, are radically altered. After the first four paragraphs dealing with the case of the Society of St. Pius X, the Holy Father goes on immediately to tackle "all the Catholic faithful". What about *your* fidelity to the Church's

Tradition, he asks in effect. That Tradition which has been authentically interpreted by the Magisterium, especially by all the Councils from Nicea onwards. There indeed is a blockbuster of a question. A question whose scope is virtually unlimited in an age in which there is hardly a single aspect of Tradition which has not been under attack from a wide spectrum of those who should know better. This is followed by a (surely unnecessary) reminder to bishops that they have a duty to safeguard the said fidelity.

### *Words for Traditionalists to Treasure*

The Pope continues with what is arguably the most important statement in the Letter, that there must be a "new awareness, not only of the lawfulness but also of the richness for the Church of a diversity of charisms, traditions of spirituality and apostolate". There, from the highest source, we have words which traditionalist Catholics should treasure. Have you, at any time in the past quarter-century, felt that you were being brow-beaten into the abandonment of the devotional life which had long lent support to your Faith, encouraged your faltering footsteps in time of difficulty, helped you to preserve in the face of temptation, either by sermons or articles which scorned what was precious to you, or simply because the atmosphere or worship in your church had become so alien to all your experience? If so, here is your charter. There are to be no thought-police in the Catholic Church. Traditional spirituality and, therefore, necessarily the forms by which it is given expression are as acceptable, as commendable, as rich for the Church as the more recent innovations.

### *"By Virtue of my Apostolic Authority, I Decree"*

The authoritative, public and urgent expression of these sentiments is, in its way, revolutionary in the post-Conciliar era. The sentiments will not everywhere be welcomed. Of some, we shall have to say: "*Aures habent, et non auditent*"; ears they have but do not hear; but that will not be acceptable. The conclusion to the Apostolic Letter is a practical one. It has three elements. First, the Holy Father says: "I decree". He is not merely expressing a wish. He

is making legal provision, which must in the last resort be enforceable. Secondly, "respect must everywhere be shown for the feelings of all those who are attached to the Latin liturgical tradition". Romanità, the age-old Vatican habit of understatement in word and deed, inhibits the phraseology of a document such as this, but when all is said and done an injunction to show respect is recognition that previously there has been disrespect. (Indeed, when I think of the occasions when I have seen the aged and infirm being taken on long journeys and then assisted to a place in church for the occasional Old-Rite Mass, it is rather a word like callousness which comes to mind.) However, respect there is to be — and why not? Even if we do not care so much for the Novus Ordo, we traditionalists have shown respect for it and its adherents by attending it peacefully, in the absence of any alternative.

### *"A Wide and Generous Appreciation of the Directives"*

Finally, the respect for our feelings is not to be merely politeness. It will have a practical aspect, namely, "a wide and generous application of the directives" in the 1984 Indult in favour of the Latin Mass, said in accordance with the 1962 Roman Missal. This does, obviously, bring us to the question of quantification. How wide is wide? The answer is already given in the same sentence: 'everywhere'. There is no place now where the Old Rite can legitimately be banned in the face of requests from those who are attached to it. And "generous"? Note that it is not to be persons who have to be generous; that would be too subjective. The adjective applies to the application of the Indult and here my dictionary tells me to expect something that is "ample, copious, abundant". This does not, of course, mean completely unlimited. The terms of the Indult have not so far been altered but, in the context of *Ecclesia Dei*, the only one which imposes a practical limitation is the proviso which says, in effect, that observance of the reformed rite is not to be prejudiced.

There is obviously one further limiting factor — quite simply, the numbers who in 1988 are still interested. When, in 1980, the Holy See addressed an enquiry to all bishops on this matter, great interest was aroused and large num-

bers in this country gave favourable answers to an opinion poll organised by one of the Catholic papers. Since then, and more particularly since promulgation of the Indult, the number of celebrations in the Old Rite has greatly increased. But the geographical spread is patchy and Sunday Masses have been isolated occurrences. Only a minority have gained much and most of them have had to make considerable sacrifices of time, effort and expense in order to attend any Mass. The new provision will not, for most of us, require the same degree of sacrifice but, given that we cannot necessarily expect the Old Rite in our own church at precisely the time that suits us every week, we are being offered the opportunity to make a smaller sacrifice more often. It is important that we do so.

### *The Pope's Letter More Than a Response to a Particular Situation*

*Ecclesia Dei* is clearly an immediate response to a particular situation, but it can be seen as more than that. It has become notorious in Pope John Paul's pontificate how a veritable war has been waged from within against his person and his policy, indeed against the hierarchical Church as such. Notorious in Nicaragua, in the Netherlands, in the United States. Less notoriously but insidiously, the neo-Modernists elsewhere have striven to render Papal authority nugatory and to eliminate the element of the supernatural in our religion. This is not news. What may perhaps be new is a sufficiently clear recognition in the Vatican that, out there behind the talking Church, there are still many Catholics who want no part of neo-Modernism, who remain attached to the Faith in which they were brought up, who are in principle loyal to the Papacy and to Tradition, but *who are losing confidence*. They read or hear of all the orthodox statements in Synod documents or papal allocutions, they know of the various disciplinary pronouncements from the Vatican, but they see nothing change for the better. It is not unreasonable then to look at the Apostolic Letter as a move to mobilise the support which Rome desperately needs in its long and painful struggle to restore order within the Church.

Even today, far too many, if not most Catholics seem unaware of what is happening to them as Progressive neo-Modernism continues its deadly sweep through the Catholic Church. In this first of two articles, Father Paul Crane inquires into the reasons for this unawareness on the part of so many Catholics, which is marked tragically by the drift-away from the Faith of hundreds of thousands of Catholics, mostly amongst the young.

#### CURRENT COMMENT

# Drift Away from the Faith

## I. THE REASON WHY

THE EDITOR

### *Warmly Recommended*

I HAVE been reading with a great deal of interest and, indeed, satisfaction, what is described by its American publishers as the fifth printing of Michael Davies', *Pope John's Council*, the second volume of his trilogy under the title of "The Liturgical Revolution". I read the first edition a little over ten years ago when it was published in 1977. I was not sufficiently aware then, as I am now, of the real strength at present of the destructive currents that were then beginning to run through the Catholic Church. Be that as it may, I am extremely grateful to Michael Davies for heightening my awareness of these currents, now in full spate, that are coursing through the Church, not only in this country, but throughout the world. The Author's insight into the whole tragic story is quite astonishing, his presentation of that story remarkable for its clarity; above all for the measured fashion in which it is presented. There is no vindictiveness here; none of that some-

what crude fanaticism, built too often on a rather unlovely mixture of fantasy and obsession, which closes the mind effectively to any kind of true objectivity. Michael Davies' mind is free completely of this kind of closure. His is as clear and objective a presentation of the Council and its aftermath as I know; at the same time, handed to the reader in a style that is popular in the best sense of the word, meaning by that an account of the Church's present tragedy that can be read and understood with great profit by all, irrespective of where they stand in the social scale. And they will find in Davies' account a great love of the Church expressed in words in no way derisory of those who, consciously or not, are betraying what she stands for. The combination is both rare and telling. Objective clarity, laced through with charity that is true, in no way 'soft'; quite unafraid to criticise where criticism is called for, whatever rank within the Church those subject to just criticism may hold. Overall a love of the Church that is unsurpassed and a respect recognised as due to those holding rank and office within it, even when subjected by the Author to the criticism which, on objective grounds, they most certainly deserve. Small wonder, then, that I recommend this book not merely warmly, but urgently.

### *How Can They Know and Why Should They?*

And why urgently? For one very simple reason which is that, even now, after some twenty years, at least, of the sweep of an all-engulfing Progressive neo-Modernism which besets us, the great majority of Catholics still appear as not knowing what it is all about. They stand, still bewildered at what is happening to them. Should they know? I am inclined to reply with another question, Why should they? Consider, if you will, their position. I am speaking here of the laity — husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, who have their lives to lead in an increasingly secularized world and I am thinking at the moment and, in particular, of the western industrialized and urbanized world. I think it would be true to say that the lives of any good Catholic couple, living in that world, are necessarily so taken up with their family duties — with that of looking after the children and keeping the home — that it is virtually im-

possible for them to devote any time to the business of themselves grasping their Faith more deeply or, indeed, teaching anything beyond its rudiments to their children, in an effort to equip themselves and their families with a background of understanding and a depth of knowledge that will enable them to pass correct judgment on and stand in opposition to that amalgam of heresies, rightly called neo-Modernism, which is laying siege in every manner of ways to their daily lives. Under the circumstances that govern their daily lives, this kind of action is, for them and their families, not within the bounds of rational possibility. It is very easy, nonetheless, for clergy and Religious still to speak and act as if it were so. The time is long past that they should face the true reality of the daily situation that confronts so many good Catholic families today.

### *A Working Family Today*

Consider, for example, the situation that confronts a pair of young marrieds, living, for example, in the London suburbs, both good practising Catholics whose children are baptized and whose family is growing. The husband may well have to be off to work early each morning and will be fortunate if he gets back in the evening by 5.30 or 6.00. (It will be later if he is doing extra work or night-school study with a view to the promotion he needs and is seeking, to meet the family bills.) If the children are young, he will have a little time with them each evening before they are off to bed, no more than that. Then, his own evening meal with his wife; then, the washing-up with her afterwards; then, some time with her before they themselves are off to bed. He will be tired after a hard day's work and she will be the same. The need they have when the day's work is done, is to relax together: this should be so. Are they to be expected seriously to study together the latest crisis in the Church against a background of doctrinal and moral knowledge they are expected to have acquired laboriously over past years during their off-hours? This kind of opposition is completely out of tune with the realities of their situation in the contemporary world. Whether you like it or not, *they are in it*. Nothing is to be gained by pretending that they are not. Any priest or religious who remains

afflicted, consciously or unconsciously, by this pretence must indeed be joking. Unacquainted utterly with the reality of the contemporary world and the difficulties confronting so many Catholic families whose daily lives are set within its reach, the priest or Religious labouring under the pretence that these difficulties are non-existent will bring very little, if anything at all, to those who, in reality, are daily having to try and cope with them; expecting the impossible of ordinary, good and decent Catholic men and women, whose lives the good God never intended to be tightslung in this fashion.

### *God is no Tyrant*

Were He to expect Catholic men and women to submit themselves to this kind of situation in their daily living, God would have to be classed as a tyrant, demanding the impossible of those whose circumstances forbid that they should ever attain it. No-one is bound by the impossible: *nemo tenetur ab impossibile*. It is not to be expected of Catholics that they should be so bound. What, then, of their Faith? It grows through the practice of prayer and the regular reception of the Sacraments. This supernatural gift of God is one of the three theological virtues whose roots, along with those of hope and charity, are set within the soul of every Catholic at baptism. Thereby we are enabled to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed. Faith, as the Catholic Church sees it most truly, is no leap into the unknown; has nothing to do with Luther's blind trust; is in no way related to that inner conviction of salvation so beloved of fundamentalists and contemporary, born-again Christians. "On Friday night I saw the Lord!": "No way, Madam: it could have been that you were experiencing the after-effects of three treble gins!" What the late Sir Arnold Lunn so aptly called F.I.F.—funny inside feeling—is in no way related to the *Lumen Fidei*, the Light of Faith, which enables the baptized Catholic, however poor his material condition, however illiterate and unlearned he or she may be, to pierce through, with the help of God's Grace, built up through prayer and the Sacraments, to the inner reality of the Catholic religion in itself and in relation to their own lives. The inherent Gnosticism, which dogs

the attitude of so many Progressive neo-Modernists today, reveals itself at once as false in its inability to take count of this *essential* factor in the life of every Catholic. For them, the words of men take precedence over the Word of God where the work of man's salvation is concerned; their "inner light" is experiential, out of themselves; in no way related to the *lumen fidei*, the light of Faith, which comes to men at Baptism as a gift from God.

### *The Duty of Catholic Parents*

What follows from the above is the prime duty laid on Catholic parents, more than ever in these very difficult days, to build up their children's Faith by word and example, manifested by the holiness—in no way do I shirk the word—of their own Catholic lives, sustained and strengthened by the Grace of God, channelled into their daily living through family prayer and the frequent reception of the Sacraments. This is the way to their own future and that of the Church, which is underpinned everywhere by family living of this sort. And let me say here, if I may, lest I be misunderstood, that, writing as I have done, I do not by any means exclude; in fact, I take for granted that rudimentary, yet essential understanding of the Faith that every Catholic child will receive from good Catholic parents, by word as well as by example; particularly the words of the Mother, spoken in her own time and in her own way, most tenderly to her own children in their very first years. It is at this age that children are most receptive. What they receive then at their Mother's knee, they will never lose, provided the example of good Catholic living that follows that early and most tender imparting of the Faith is all about them.

### *In Practice, the Faith is Being Lost*

Ideally, under these circumstances the Faith should never be lost. In practice this is not so. The Faith has been lost by hundreds of thousands of Catholics during the last twenty-five years or so. The drift-away—as, I think, it is best called—has been appalling, particularly amongst the young. By way of an example, a poll of Austria's young, taken round about the Holy Father's visit to that country in the first half of this year 1988, showed a large number

of its teenagers as in no way interested; their lives, in their own view, seemingly unaffected by anything the Holy Father had to say that concerned doctrine or morals, as affecting the way they lived. In other words, their assent to the Faith—if I may borrow, once again, the great Cardinal Newman's distinction—was merely notional or academic; in no way real. What I mean is that Austrian teenagers, in the same way as teenagers like themselves in other countries, regarded the truth of their Catholic Faith academically in the same way that you or I might regard without thinking, its simple dictionary definition, as something academic or notional and no more. In no way do the majority of those Austrian or other teenagers of today regard their Faith as something utterly essential to their lives, without which their living is empty, quite purposeless; so that their assent to it is in no way merely academic, but vibrant and real. Today, for so many of the young in Austria and in other countries of the West, the Catholic Religion resembles little more than a set of formulae, devoid of significant substance, irrelevant so far as their own living is concerned, adopted so very often as little more than some sort of cultural manifestation, like the old school tie in this country or a pair of *lederhosen* in the Austrian Tyrol. Not much more than that.

### *Deficient Religious Instruction to Blame*

Where are we now? At the point, I suggest, where it has to be said that Religious Instruction in Catholic schools, an essential support of good Catholic religious practice as outlined above, for a good many years *before* Vatican II was lacking in rounded substance; somewhat one-sided in that its emphasis was laid largely on Apologetics, whose importance I am *in no way* underrating, with insufficient regard being paid to the significance of the Faith where individual Catholic and family living was concerned. In this field emphasis tended to be largely negative, whereas, had it been positively applied, the significance of the Faith for daily living would have taken root in the Catholic mind and served, thereby, as a most necessary support for the Catholic Apologetic which

was well and truly taught, but which to very many seemed somewhat lifeless and irrelevant, because taken by itself; apart, that is, from any positive consideration of the significance of the Faith for daily living. So long as this positive and personal side of the Faith was insufficiently stressed, Catholicism appeared — at least to many young Catholics and, for that matter older ones too — as a religion of don'ts in which real happiness was not to be found, so far as they were concerned. For that, they had to look elsewhere. The tendency, in consequence and for the most part subconsciously, was to compartmentalize religion and life, seeing happiness on this earth as linked up with what they thought of as true living and religion as a list of duties to be observed alongside, rather than as responsible for it; what might be called an insurance policy to be taken out just in case, without its practice, something very unpleasant might await one after death. For the rest one looked elsewhere. There was little malice in this attitude. It could be described correctly as subconscious rather than anything else on the part of both teachers and taught. Life appeared to both as little more than a trudge through a vale of tears: happiness was not to be found on this earth. Yet, happiness is what we all look for. However subconsciously, the impression given to the young through this somewhat one-sided teaching approach was that happiness could not be found in the Catholic Religion. In consequence, as they saw it, it would have to be found elsewhere. What they should have been taught, with the right blend of firmness and understanding, was that, of its very nature, happiness is a bye-product that will not be found if sought directly for its own self alone; rather, the certain prize only of those whose first concern is to hold to God's Law, entrusted by His Son to the Church He founded so that, until the end of time, that Law might be given to men.

### *Social neo-Modernism*

Readers will forgive me if I have exaggerated the pre-Vatican II situation as it appears to me, on reflection over the years, to have existed in the field of Religious Instruction in what you might call the West, largely made up of developed countries. I do not think I have exaggerated.

If I am correct in this regard, it is easy enough to see how what the late Hamish Fraser called so appositely "Social Modernism" was already affecting the West, paving the way to a certain extent for the present wave of neo-Modernism which besets the Church in the aftermath of Vatican II and is still besetting it, serving that wave as a by no means insignificant precursor. For, consider — as a result of the deficiencies noted above in the teaching of the Catholic Faith to boys and girls at school, they were left innocently enough, with the thought of their Faith as little more than a set of seemingly imposed religious practices to be adhered to for their own sake and without the support that would have been theirs had they been shown the true significance of the Faith in their daily lives, as I have tried to indicate above. This they were not shown or shown only partially, so that their assent to the Faith in later life tended to grow notional rather than real. For many, the Catholic Religion tended to become a Sunday business and, really, little more. What Catholics did the rest of the week was their own business, influenced, so often unthinkingly, by the prevailing way of the world. I am not speaking here of evil; simply of what might be described as a brand of secularized naturalism and little more. But that, in itself, was bad enough. It meant that when, in the wake of Vatican II, the neo-Modernist thrust reached into the Church, with its call to suit doctrine and morals to the mood of the moment, the life-style of a good many Catholics, already glossed over — without their ever knowing it — with the *Social Modernism* of the previous years, made many of them not inattentive to the call of *Religious neo-Modernism*, in the wake of the Vatican Council, that they should suit not merely their life-style, but their religious belief to the mood of the moment. One seemed to follow from the other. Why not?; they asked. It was only logical that Religious neo-Modernism should follow Social in this fashion.

So they began to drift. The drift continues to this day. The Church being an hierarchical society, one must ask why Hierarchical Authority did not stop it. Analysis of this all-important question will have to wait until next month.

Friends have described *RENEW* as "a great night out, a good chance for a cuppa and a chat"; is it no more than that? Others tell of a parish where the weekly income has dropped by \$1,000 dollars. Why did that happen? The Committee on Doctrine of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (U.S.A.) published its findings on *RENEW* after an examination of the [U.S.A.] material and after dialogue with American bishops who had experienced *RENEW*.

The U.S. Committee on Doctrine said that in *RENEW*, basic Christian themes were not related sufficiently to Roman Catholic tradition and practice — to what is distinctly Catholic in our Faith — and further that *RENEW* "does not indicate the teaching of the Church that gives meaning to the living tradition which forms the basis for authentic Catholic renewal" and warned that "we must be concerned about what" *RENEW* "teaches by exclusion as well as by inclusion."

We are grateful to Fr. Fitzpatrick for this careful and gentle study of the *RENEW PROCESS* that has been imported from the U.S.A. The Author is Parish Priest of Quorn, South Australia. Acknowledgements and thanks to *Fidelity*, published in Australia by John XXIII Cooperative Ltd.

## Renew and You

REV. FR. A. T. FITZPATRICK

I MUST admit that, as I believe in the supernatural and in a revealed Faith that has to be taught and defended, I feel frustrated at times when I do not seem to be able to get through to people just what this psychological gimmickry is all about. It is being substituted for holiness; for true renewal found by sorrow for sin, a good Confession, a resolution to do God's will in spite of my feelings and

experiences, a greater appreciation of the wonder of my Faith known more and more, a greater actual participation in my, or rather Christ's, sacrifice at Mass, my realisation that I have to deny myself, take up my cross and follow Him, and love God with my whole self first and then my neighbour as myself. It is being substituted for greater prayer life in both vocal prayer and contemplation (which for many is through the Rosary), as well as the reading of Scripture and pious books, the lives of the Saints, visits to the Blessed Sacrament as I believe Christ is really present, the Risen Lord. So much to do and none of it can be substituted for by psychological gimmicks. Christ has left us the way to holiness in the Church. The "experts" are so busy trying to supplant His way with something else . . . sociological conditioning. They are of course on the natural tack because so many of them do not believe in the supernatural. They are secular humanists claiming to be Catholics; and dragging others down to their lack of faith.

Too many people cannot see the dangers of substituting psychological techniques for religious formation. In Renew we are told "Say whatever you like because it will be right just because you've said it". And members are told to support each other no matter what is said and not to contradict each other or act as parish "soapbox theologians". Everything is said to be "based on their own experiences and feelings".

### **1. Non-contradiction leads to agnosticism and relativism.**

It is as if "I like vanilla icecream, you like strawberry, so what" is made equivalent to "I think abortion is a great evil and a serious sin, you don't, so what". We Catholics have a revealed taught faith and morality which we must hold to — and know — and have an apologetic for.

**2. Narcissism . . . belly-button gazing . . .** infatuation with one's own "experiences and feelings" can lead to the rejection of external law and truth. "I am my own master, I'm a mature Catholic who makes up my own mind about things". They tell them to do so. The Pope has warned us that dissent in moral matters could prevent us receiving the sacraments. (See his talk to the American hierarchy.)

**3. Therapeutic psycholyogical judgment** triumphs over religious judgements in the "I feel good about it, so why

is it a sin!" Most temptations are about something that feels good but isn't. This "if it feels good to do it" is pushed everywhere.

**4. Reductionism.** e.g. "Jesus changed the water into wine at Cana because He felt sorry for them". Which is not biblical and trivialises the fact that when He acted He showed His glory and His disciples believed in Him. He was revealing His divinity at Our Lady's request for help. See the trivialisation of the Peter the Rock scene in Renew. Trivialisation of the Sacraments is found in Renew's pseudo-sacraments of "forgiveness, eucharist and confirmation"; being sent to witness, oil-anointed with the oil blessed on the spot. Reminds me of the old joke of the mother who asked the bishop to confirm her son again as it didn't take last year.

**5. Mind and Will** become subject to my "feelings or experiences" whereas emotions ought to be subject to reason and will. Emotions can, as Pope Paul VI said, obscure the gaze of truth. We do not balance the "genuineness of the emotion" against the facts of truth . . . or mortality.

**6. Values clarification via feelings.** "How strongly do you feel about abortion?" Feelings do not affect the rightness or wrongness of facts; the appeal ought to be to reason and objective evidence and natural law. As in statistics, the questions put condition the answer. Whereas our Faith is the revealed and Magisterially safeguarded answer.

**7. A false theory of ethics arises,** "No feelings are bad". "No experiences are bad". Feelings do matter and experiences do matter; external action is not the only thing that matters. Feelings and experiences can be the seed sources of the seven deadly sins. Our Lord cautioned us against anger; and lustful thoughts. How often nowadays are childhood experiences given as the root-cause of evils ?

Such sayings as "One has a right to feel the way you do" and "Moods are neither right nor wrong", may well lead to problems if spoken to some. They could justify sinful feelings that they have. But if you want to see what God thinks of feelings look up what He says to Cain in the Cain-Abel story.

**8. The absence of the theme of sin** is noteworthy in these renewal materials. Well-intentioned therapeutics can lead to an error in mind. There are things we are guilty of when we go against our conscience (which ought to be an informed one) and we ought to know that we have sinned, know what sin is, and how God regards it. How He has warned us of the consequences of it; what it cost Christ too. Note also that "God accepts us as we are" is becoming a heresy when we mean that He is not calling us to repentance and conversion and holiness.

**9. The seeds of relativism** are sown in over-emphasis on flexibility, adaptation and change. Natural law is objective truth, cannot be changed. Revealed truth too, in spite of so many "experts" in the Church, is not relative to time or place. Not everything is inculcable or adaptable or good. Some "pluralism" is just an attempt to deny the principle of contradiction which is the basis of all logical thought. "A thing cannot be true and not be true under the same aspect at the same time".

**10. Moral dilemmas** are often posed so that the conclusion to be drawn is that breaking God's law is necessary. This tends to make people think that sin is all right in certain circumstances. Again the relativism is pushed. Stupid scenarios are given to make them think that God's law must be breakable.

Too much weight is put on psychological techniques via sensitivity training, making the people give in to the encounter group, setting mood through music, lights, street (or room) drama of the simplistic type etc. The use of these as a sort of hypnosis is, of course, anti-rational and therefore anti-human, and so anti-Catholic. True renewal would make us more in conformity with reality, more human, more Catholic. It would take some strength (which a few priests had at a pseudo-confirmation service at a priests' conference recently to *not* do what the group wants you to do. Even adults are subject to peer pressure. It requires courage to refuse to follow the group; even among priests.

Finally the fact that doctrine is eschewed by so many renewal schemes, so that they could be used as well by Callathumpians as by us, ought to wake us up to the fact that they are not to do with Catholic renewal. New

church perhaps, but hardly true Church. After all, we judge everything we do by our Catholic Faith, doctrines and morals, not by our feelings and experiences.

Add to that that so many do not want to be woken up lest they have to take a stand; it is more comfortable just to let things go on. Damn those fundamentalist Catholics who think that we have to stand up for the Faith, even at cost to our own comfort ! That frightens people ! Becoming aware means YOU have to act. Crikey !! Better not to wake up. Teach and defend the Faith — Hell !

There are so many pseudo-Catholic things in this Renew which is not Catholic that it is truly pseudo-renewal. **A scam !**

---

### **PLEASE NOTE**

That any book mentioned in this or other issues of *Christian Order* is obtainable from :

Holy Cross Catholic Bookshop,  
4, Brownhill Road,  
London SE26 2FJ : UK.

and

Carmel of Plymouth,  
1, Grenville Road,  
St. Jude's,  
Plymouth : UK.

Of all the visible creatures, man is the only one that has the ability to speak, and his language is inextricably associated with his ability to think. The discovery of how language originated is, therefore, a matter of major anthropological importance and one that relates to our own origin and how we should view ourselves. It affects the basis of all the human sciences from psychology and linguistics to sociology, literature and medicine.

Three explanations of the origin of language have been offered. One is that language emerged naturally from methods used by animals to communicate with each other. The second is that man developed it himself when he reached a sufficiently high degree of intelligence. The third is divine creation. These three possibilities are considered below.

# Language-Origins and Evolution

## I. NATURAL EMERGENCE OF LANGUAGE

D. TASSOT

PARTISANS of this theory hold that the difference between human language and the "languages" of animals is not one of nature but of degree. It has been known, for instance, since the time of Karl von Frisch that the "dance of the bee" indicates to the entire hive the direction, the distance and the quantity of a source of pollen. In the 1970's, the naturalist Emil Mengel observed transmission of information taking place within a group of chimpanzees.

Some food and some fake snakes were hidden in a field in the presence of the leader of a group of chimpanzees. The leader informed the group by signs and they all

returned, with the younger ones in front, to secure the food and avoid the snakes. (1. p.144)

Do such information methods, useful though they may be, infer the mental operations which make human language not merely a tool for communication but the substratum upon which thought deploys itself?

Natural-emergence supporters hoped to show that young apes, provided they were raised amongst men, would be able to acquire the rudiments of human language. There were two series of tests, one taking place before and the other after 1960. In 1933, Dr. J. Kellog and his wife had the idea of raising a young chimpanzee, Gua, with their own child. Gua was eventually able to react to 166 words, but was never able to speak. In 1951, the Hayeses took into their family the young chimp, Viki, for six and a half years and claimed that it succeeded in articulating something resembling "papa", "mama" and "cup", although the words were very deformed. These unfruitful tests were not renewed because Philip Lieberman, a phonetician, explained that even if the ape's larynx included vocal cords, the structure of its vocal tract (nasal cavity, velum and epiglottis in particular) prevents it from emitting the fundamental vowels (a, i, o, u,) of the human language (1. p. 20-21). This could have been the end of the story. The desire to prove the animal origin of man, however, is so strong that five American psychologists, between 1966 and 1977, attempted to initiate apes into a dumb form of language. Three trials took place using the American Sign Language (AMESLAN) which consists of alphabetic signs being traced in the palm of the hand for the use of deaf and dumb people. There were the Gardners with Washoe starting in 1966, Herbert Terrace with Nim from 1973 to 1977, and Francine Patterson with the gorilla Koko from 1972 at Stanford University.

In 1966, at the Santa Barbara University in California, the Premacks attempted to introduce Sarah to a language composed of symbolic objects such as a square representing a banana, a triangle for an apple, a silhouette for an ape for Sarah. Finally, as from 1970, at the Regional Centre of Primate Studies at Yerkes, Duane Rumbaugh taught Lana to use a computer with keys bearing geometric symbols for words (1. p. 21-40). To start with, the research

workers published encouraging reports. The apes were very quick in tracing for themselves the AMESLAN signs to obtain corresponding rewards. They were even able to recognise and produce sequences of two and sometimes even three signs. The question therefore arose as to whether, for the ape, these signs correspond to "words", and the sequences to "sentences". Did they represent an embryonic grammar? Then came the doubters. When Sarah lined up three signs to form the sequence "give Sarah banana", had she made up a grammatical phrase similar to the "telegraphic" style of a two-year-old child, or had she merely adopted a conditioned behaviour to obtain a reward, similar to all animals undergoing training. According to the linguist Chomsky, mastery of a language by a child can, obviously, only be considered in terms of a complete acquisition following the "telegraphic stage". Otherwise, because a child can jump, he could be compared to a bird and be said to be able to fly, even though imperfectly! (1. p. 125).

In 1975, Lenneberg performed a counter-experiment. He submitted some college students to the same training for learning symbols as the Premacks had given to Sarah. The students rapidly outperformed the chimpanzees but none of them considered that the graphic signs could correspond to words, nor the sequences to phrases. They all believed they were being asked to resolve a kind of puzzle. In 1969, Terrace himself recognised that "evidence that apes can create sentences can, in each case, be explained by reference to simpler non-linguist processes". (1. p.149). In 1978, Premack wrote : "Chimps do not have any significant degree of human language and when, in two to five years, this fact becomes properly disseminated, it will be of interest to ask, why were we so easily duped by the claim that they do?" (1. p. 154). *Prejudice for evolution is the answer which has introduced error into much of the research in the human sciences.* (Italics mine—Editor). Repeated experiments, undertaken at great expense, over many years, by psychologists subscribing to the evolutionary theory, have been needed to reach the conclusion that the natural emergence of language from the animal is impossible. Evolutionists consider that the evolutionary route leading to man must pass through the primates. The

only animals, however, possessing a vocal tract capable of reproducing our words are birds, as for example the parrot and mynah. The question arises then, how could we be descendants of the apes and inherit the characteristics of the birds?

## 2. THE HUMAN CONSTRUCTION OF LANGUAGE

The proposition was already advanced by Herder in 1770, in his *Origin of Language*. It is proposed today by Piaget, the celebrated specialist in infant psychology. He posits that all knowledge is acquired through the subject's action upon, and interaction with people and things, and that language has its origin in the sensorimotor period of the child's life, at about 18 months, when the representation of things becomes possible in the mind of the child. Language would not, therefore, be an innate aptitude, but an acquisition of action patterns like dancing or knitting, an intellectual tool to serve man's specific needs. An objection could be made from the fact of the universality of language. Apart from the gravely deficient, all children eventually acquire the intuitive rules of language and the capacity to express themselves by means of intelligible sentences. The same thing does not apply to intellectual exercises such as mathematics. Universality, therefore, makes for innateness.

It is, moreover, strange that language should depend upon the general sensori-motor development of the child. Even if children learn to talk at an early age, they are late in learning to walk. A child of 3 years who employs with precision several hundred coordinated muscle movements needed to articulate clearly will still spill a glass of milk, fall over in running and not always master the sphincters relative to the most elementary functions of the body. These facts of experience can be explained by the physiology of the brain. Two areas of the brain are connected with language. The frontal area in the left hemisphere was discovered by Paul Broca in 1865. Damage to this area leads to language impairment, termed "aphasia" (2. p.108). Adjacent to it is a part of the cortex which receives auditory signals. This was discovered by Carl Wernicke in 1874.

Damage to the Wernicke area affects speech comprehension, causing the subject to pronounce grammatically

correct sentences that have no meaning. These two hemispheres are linked by a bundle of nerve fibres. Such an asymmetrical development of the brain accompanies the acquisition of language. It is completed at the age of puberty, after which time it becomes impossible to learn to talk (as in the case of 'feral children'), and much more difficult to acquire a second language (hence the interest in bilingual schools). In 1973, Dr. John C. Eccles pointed out that human infants are born with this cerebral asymmetry which is missing in non-human primates. Furthermore, the enlargement of the language area in the left hemisphere anticipates considerably its eventual usage in speech, as it can already be detected in a 5-month-old fetus (1. p.72). Thus language is programmed in a child from its conception, even though it can only be realised in a human environment where the child can exercise its inborn faculty (within the limits of its "mother" tongue).

Artificial languages, created by man for his own needs (mathematics, data processing language, etc.), prove quite different from natural languages. Suited to operations of the intelligence, they are incapable of expressing feelings. They possess a singleness of meaning as demonstrated in the rigidity of mathematical definitions. Normal language, however, functions due to a relative ambiguity of the words. It would be impossible to understand one another if one specific word existed for each separate thing. Common words correspond to approximate classes and define themselves relatively to each other, without it being impossible or necessary to specify the limits of these classes with any precision.

Finally, if language was a tool, it would be seen to perfect itself with civilisation. In fact, it is the contrary that is seen to occur. So-called "primitive" peoples possess surprisingly rich and subtle languages which amaze the grammar experts (3. p.19). At the same time, our written languages have demonstrated a progressive impoverishment in their grammar (compensated, it is true, by an increase of technical vocabulary). The oblique case disappeared from the French language quite some time ago, and in English the verbal forms such as the subjunctive have been falling into disuse over recent generations.

Clearly, if linguistic systems are running down with time whilst the range of techniques is expanding, language cannot be considered to be a voluntary product of the human intelligence.

### 3. THE DIVINE CREATION OF LANGUAGE

Humanity does not construct language, it finds it. As can be seen from the foregoing, the physiological particularities proper to language (vocal tract, cerebral specialisation) are inscribed in the genetic inheritance. The implementation of language in the child is affected by the parents received it from their parents, thus confirming that humanity is not an aggregate of individuals but a collection of families.

The origin of language can perhaps be discerned. If our parents received it from their parents, the chain goes back inevitably to the common ancestor of all humanity, Adam. It is this fact which explains the hereditary universality of the mental operations which are characteristic of language. It also explains the capacity for men to understand each other despite the diversity of specific languages issuing from Babel. The question is, therefore, from who did Adam receive the language? Genesis specifies that Adam could find no creatures from amongst the animals to be his interlocutor, and indicates it was God Himself who was Adam's immediate and privileged interlocutor. It is, therefore, from God that came the two elements of language, the genetic inheritance (formulated by God the Creator), and the oral implementation (by God the first interlocutor).

Language has not, then, emerged progressively from a voiceless stage of creation. It was not invented to fulfil some material need of the first humans. It was there from the beginning. "In the beginning was the Word". The Word, the singularity that explains the origin of all things. It provided the means of relating with God. It was a prayer which was the first form and still remains the most perfect form of the human language.

Man was created in the image of the Word. He was prepared genetically to receive the word and to transmit it, not like something external that can be acquired or rejected, but like the essence of his own being, the innate difference

which distinguishes him from other living creatures. It is the ultimate point of his being by which he communicates with the Supreme being, the specific resemblance with the Creator which enables him to ponder Creation, to know God and to love him.

Man, the servant of the Word, can only regress if, instead of lovingly cultivating the language received from his ancestors, he uses it merely for worldly ends. This regression can be seen in the decrease of the capacity to reason due to the influence of television which is a "locutor" and not an "interlocutor". It is plain in the ideologically governed societies where self-criticism and mental restraints are induced. This is the reason, as Joseph Brodsky the Nobel laureate explains, why there is no place for poets in these societies. Even if their works make no allusion to politics, their mere presence as guardians of the language is intolerable to the ideologists who use the language as an instrument of domination.

Poetry is the language in its fullest dimension, it not only arouses emotion but transmits it as well. It has the universal character of passing through the intelligence to reach the heart and possesses an intensity that draws upon all the vocal chords, all the semantic levels and all the subtleties of natural languages. Nothing could be explained about language if it were not for poetry, for its faculty of creativeness and its power of giving life to our thoughts and strength to our feelings. How could this creative faculty arise if it had not been received from the Creator Himself? This spring of life, how could one drink from it if it did not come from He who is Life? How could this faculty, which is inseparable from the life of the spirit, have appeared if it did not spring from the Spirit itself?

It is for this reason that our words attain reality despite our finitude. The universe is Christocentric, "all having been made by Him and for Him" and due to the fact that all words reflect the Word of God.

#### Notes

- (1) Clifford Wilson and Donald McKeon, *The Language Gap* (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1984).
- (2) H. Hecaen and J. Dubois, *La Naissance de la Neuropsychologie du Langage*. (Flammarion, Paris 1969).
- (3) E. O. Lorimer, *Language Hunting in the Kerakoran* (George Allen and Unwin, London 1940).

These two Clarifications addressed to Episcopal Conferences throughout the world, were issued by the Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship on September 22nd, 1987 and May 8th, 1985. They are published here for the convenience of readers, especially for those worried to death by current liturgical aberrations.

# Two Clarifications

## 1: EXTRAORDINARY MINISTERS

September 22, 1987

THE Congregation for the Sacraments has asked the Apostolic Nunciature to bring to your attention the following communication regarding the "extraordinary ministers of the Eucharist".

One of the most special forms of participation of the faithful laity in the liturgical activity of the Church is surely the faculty granted to them to distribute Holy Communion as "extraordinary ministers". (cfr. Can. 230, par. 3; 910, par. 2)

This faculty has been the means of real help to both the celebrant and the faithful, when a large number of people want to receive Holy Communion. But, unfortunately, in some cases it has led to serious abuses, either because the extraordinary nature of this faculty has been overlooked, or because the faculty itself has been considered as a kind of prize to some good lay people in recognition of their collaboration.

The abuses may occur in the following situations:

- If the "extraordinary ministers" of the Eucharist distribute Holy Communion, together with the celebrant, when the number of communicants does not constitute a case of necessity;
- If the "extraordinary ministers" distribute Holy Communion, together with the celebrant, to a large number of communicants, when there are other "ordinary ministers"

available, even if the latter are not taking part in the celebration.

— If the “extraordinary ministers” distribute Holy Communion to themselves and to the faithful, while the “ordinary ministers”— celebrant and concelebrants — remain inactive.

Having received many complaints about such abuses from all over the world, the Congregation for the Sacraments has asked the Pontifical Commission for the Authentic Interpretation of the Code of Canon Law for the exact interpretation of Can. 910, par. 2, and Can. 230, par. 3, which refer precisely to the “extraordinary ministry” of the Eucharist. The question was formulated as follows:

*“Utrum minister extraordinarius Sacrae Communionis ad normam cann. 910, par. 2, et 230, par. 3, deputatus suum munus suppletorium exercere possit etiam cum praesentes sint in ecclesia, etsi ad celebrationem eucharisticam non participantes, ministri ordinari qui non sint quoque modo impediti”.*

The answer given by the aforesaid Pontifical Commission in its Plenary session of the 20 February, 1987 was: *negative*.

This authentic interpretation was approved by the Holy Father on the 15 June, 1987, and the Congregation for the Sacraments was entrusted to communicate it to the Episcopal Conference throughout the world.

As we can see, the answer of the Pontifical Commission shows clearly that, in the presence of “ordinary ministers of the Eucharist”—(Bishops, priests, deacons—cfr. Can. 910, par. 1), whether they are taking part in the celebration or not, provided they are sufficient in number and not engaged in other ministries, *it is not permitted to the extraordinary ministers to distribute Holy Communion, either to themselves or to others.*

In order to put an end to the abuses that may be taking place in this country, and to prevent others from taking place, the Congregation for the Sacraments has charged this Apostolic Nunciature to communicate the above-mentioned “authentic interpretation” to you, and, through you, to all the other members of your Episcopal Conference.

Finally, the Holy See begs all the Bishops to follow this matter with vigilant care, so that the clarification contained in this present communication may no longer be evaded, but may contribute to restore the exact observance of the liturgical discipline on an issue of such importance.

Finally, the Holy See begs all the bishops to follow this matter with vigilant care, so that the clarification contained in this present communication may no longer be evaded, but may contribute to restore the exact observance of the liturgical discipline on an issue of such importance.

## 2: CONCERNING: Communion in the Hand

May 8, 1985

The Holy See, since 1969, while maintaining the traditional manner of distributing communion, has granted to those Episcopal Conferences that have requested it, the faculty of distributing communion by placing the host in the hands of the faithful.

This faculty is governed by the Instructions *Memoriale Domini* and *Immensea caritatis* (29 May, 1969: *ASS* 61, 1969, 541-546; 29 January, 1973: *ASS* 65, 1973, 264-271) and by the Ritual *De sacra Communione* published 21 June, 1973, n. 21. Nevertheless it would seem to be opportune to draw attention to the following points:

1. Communion in the hand should show, as much as communion on the tongue, due respect towards the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. For this reason emphasis should be laid, as was done by the Fathers of the Church, upon the dignity of the gesture of the communicant. Thus, the newly baptised were directed to stretch out both hands making "the left hand a throne for the right hand, which receives the King" (*Fifth mystagogical catechesis of Jerusalem*, n. 21: *PG* 33, col. 1125, or *Sources chrét.*, 126, p. 171; St. John Chrysostom, *Homily 47*: *PG* 63, col. 898, etc.)\*

2. Again following the teaching of the Fathers, insistence is to be laid upon the importance of the *Amen* said in response to the formula of the minister "The Body of

\*In practice the opposite direction has to be given to the faithful: the left hand is to be placed upon the right hand, so that the sacred host can be conveyed to the mouth with the right hand.

Christ"; this *Amen* is an affirmation of faith: "Cum ergo petieris, dicit tibi sacerdos 'Corpus Christi' et tu dicis 'Amen', hoc est 'verum'; quod confitetur lingua, teneat affectus" (St. Ambrose *De Sacramentis*, 4, 25: *SC* bis, p. 116).

3. The communicant who has received the Eucharist in the hand is to consume it before returning to his place, moving aside yet remaining facing the altar in order to allow the person following to approach the minister.

4. It is from the Church that the faithful receive the holy Eucharist, which is communion in the Body of the Lord and in the Church; for this reason the communicant should not take from the paten or container, as would be done for ordinary bread, but the hands must be stretched out to receive it from the minister of communion.

5. Out of respect for the Eucharist, cleanliness of hands is expected, children need to be reminded of this.

6. It is necessary that the faithful receive sound catechesis in this matter, and that insistence be laid upon the sentiments of adoration and respect that are required towards this most holy sacrament (cf. *Dominicae cenae*, n. 11). Care must be taken that fragments of the consecrated host are not lost (Cf: Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 2 May, 1972: Prot. n. 89/71, in *Notitiae* 1972. p. 227).

7. The faithful are not to be obliged to adopt the practice of communion in the hand, each one is free to communicate in one way or the other.

These norms and those indicated in the documents cited above are designed to recall the duty of respect for the Eucharist and apply independently of the way in which communion is received.

Those who have the care of souls should insist not only upon the necessary dispositions for the fruitful reception of communion, which in certain instances demands recourse to the sacrament of Reconciliation, but also upon an external attitude which conveys a sense of respect in general and expresses in particular the belief of the faithful in the Eucharist.

# Book Review

## REVIEW-ARTICLE

### TEILHARDIAN MYTH

(1) **Teilhardism and the New Religion** by Wolfgang Smith, Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., Rockford, Illinois 61105, U.S.A.

*Teilhardism and the New Religion*, by Dr. Wolfgang Smith, is a revelation of gargantuan dimensions. It is vitally relevant to every aspect of the Church and society. Consequently it is a book that should capture the attention of every member of the Church. It is not a discussion of just one of the many problems assailing the Church but a presentation of the single predominating problem from which all others, without exception arise. It is a complete exposure of the way in which more than two entire generations of Catholics have been misled. All eyes should be riveted on this document because in exposing the root of the illness it reveals the cure.

Father Pierre Teilhard de Chardin was once very well known within scientific and theological circles. For most people today, however, he is either unknown or just a personality that caused a stir in his day and is now out of date. Dr. Wolfgang Smith, a profound expositor of traditional Christian doctrine and a scientist with a degree in physics and philosophy plus a Ph.D. in mathematics, who provided the theoretical key to the solution of the famed re-entry problem for space flight, is well qualified to examine Teilhardism in the light of modern science and traditional Church teaching. Although Fr. Teilhard de Chardin is dead and almost forgotten, Dr. Smith explains how his devastating dogmas are not only alive and relevant today but have given rise to a parallel religion which is being offered to people as a substitute for the true religion. In the same way as the author accuses Fr. Teilhard of "cheating with words", so the members of the "new religion" are being cheated with words. Words like Original Sin, Baptism, Redemption and many others are being used, but

their doctrinal meaning has been drained off and replaced by a new Teilhardian meaning. "Deny one Dogma", the author says, "one seemingly fine point of fundamental theology—and you have implicitly denied all the rest." (p. 239). The new religion is presenting itself under Christian colours, "but as is always the case, heretical Christianity is not Christianity" (p. 239).

It is not just because there are still numerous intellectuals in the Church sympathetic to Teilhardian thought, that Wolfgang Smith undertakes his detailed analysis, it is more because this thought has permeated modern theology to the remarkable extent it has.

One of the author's first tasks, in his role as a highly informed scientist, is to point out that Fr. Teilhard's belief in evolution as a scientific fact is totally without foundation. The entire edifice of Teilhardian teaching is based upon evolution being a scientific fact. "What makes the world in which we live specifically modern is our discovery in it and around it of evolution" (p. 299, *Phenomenon of Man*, Teilhard de Chardin). Teilhard writes: "What we have to do . . . is to modify the position occupied by the central core of Christianity . . ." (p. 179, *Christianity and Evolution*). Take away evolution which forms the infrastructure of his dogma, and all the rest crumbles. But evolution is still fiercely believed by his present-day advocates and by the vast number following the new religion. Dr. Smith mentions some of the evidence from molecular biology and the laws of physics which, despite strenuous attempts to keep it alive, have given the death blow to evolutionary theory. The fact that it is still held as dogma by the majority of scientists is an inevitable consequence of over a century of indoctrination. Little by little, however, the scientific impossibility of an evolutive force causing order to come from disorder and the complex from the simple, must be accepted. This basic law of increasing entropy, for which there are no known exceptions in the entire universe, demands it.

The question always raised is what difference does it make whether one believes in evolution or not. Fr. Teilhard provided the answer by changing the Church's teaching to fit his conception of an evolving cosmos. It seems that

once an infallible doctrine is disputed, a religious frontier is crossed into a territory where there are no fixed norms. As one advances into that territory the more confidence one acquires to question other sacred teachings. Eventually the point is reached where nothing is considered so immutable and sacred that it cannot be re-interpreted and adapted to the world in which we live. As soon as the frontier is crossed we are no longer as little children before Almighty God, where all is mystery and wonder, where the slightest offence troubles our soul until it is confessed and absolution obtained, where our daily problems are shared with Christ and his Mother before the tabernacle, where morning and night prayers and private visits to the church are a regular feature, where we fall to our knees in silent adoration before the true living presence in the Blessed Sacrament, where the resolution of any problem, whether small or large, spiritual or practical, would be unthinkable without recourse to our guardian angel. Instead we become "mature adults", where we no longer need to run to God with every little problem, where we can accommodate ourselves to a society and media that is fundamentally opposed to the moral teaching of the Church, where the tabernacle is merely a store-place for unused hosts and should not inhibit us from acting as naturally in its presence as we would in any other public building, where the church is just a place for parish activities including weekly services, where rigidity, whether it be towards the magisterium of Canon Law, should be sedulously avoided as an infringement upon human rights, where eventually we have a religion which is designed not to cramp our style and to be contained within perfectly human dimensions. Cast doubt upon God's sacred word and the spell which binds us to Him is broken. Fr. Teilhard provided the rationale to break the spell, and that rationale was Darwinian evolution. That same evolution theory which has compelled vast numbers of students to reject the notion of a divinity because they have learned that the whole cosmos can be explained by a naturalistic, mechanistic process of evolutionary change. Hydrogen gas evolving into people over thousands of millions of years, although nonsense in terms of physics and chemistry, is believed to have happened. Clearly if this is so, the Creator God of the

Bible is irrelevant. Teilhard recognised this fact, and instead of questioning the validity of evolution theory, he conceived of a new theology to accommodate it. Believing he was destroying an illusion he succeeded in destroying reality. People who are still ingenuous enough to believe that evolution theory makes no difference to their religious beliefs, more than anyone else should read this book.

Wolfgang Smith's analysis is both scholarly and measured. He examines the obscurities of Teilhard's language to determine as precisely as possible the intended meaning. He draws attention to those statements that allow apologists such as Henri de Lubac to plead orthodoxy, and to the fact that those same statements are contradicted elsewhere. He shows how selected writings, particularly his earlier ones, could give the impression that Fr. Teilhard respected the infallibility of doctrinal teaching. It is only by examining closely the context from which the selected writings are taken and comparing them with others of a later date that it becomes clear that Teilhard's ideas upon infallibility are quite different from those of the Church. For instance, he writes, "to say the Church is infallible is simply to say that, in virtue of being a living organism, the Christian group contains in itself . . . a certain sense of direction and certain potentialities; ill-defined though these are, they enable it to grope its way constantly probing in this direction or that to maturity or self-fulfillment" (*Christianity and Evolution*, p. 153). Wolfgang Smith comments: "The Church is infallible in a certain sense because in a distinctly supernatural way it stands under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit . . . For indeed, if the Church is infallible 'in virtue of being a living organism' then we arrive at the strange conclusion that this infallibility is shared by amoeba and buffalo! And since amoeba and buffalo are not in fact infallible, one must conclude that neither is the Church. . . Thus by misrepresenting the idea of infallibility as a kind of pragmatic wisdom, Teilhard has also by implication denied the universal validity of doctrinal pronouncements. It is obvious that so long as the idea refers to a self-corrective groping (such as is to be found in the behaviour of animals or even servo-mechanisms), it cannot apply to such things as the Christological affirmation of the Councils. It will hardly be necessary to follow Teilhard any

further on his victorious sweep, as he proceeds to explain in succession the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, Revelation, Miracles, Original Sin and Redemption, Hell, and finally, the Eucharist. Everywhere it is the same story, all that exists in the end is the evolution process—‘That, when all is said and done, is the first, the last, and the only thing in which I believe’ (Teilhard de Chardin, *Christianity and Evolution* p. 99)”. (p. 218/9).

Such dedication to the evolution process led Fr. Teilhard de Chardin to fuse the true religion with an imaginary one of his own invention. In a letter, quoted by the Author (p. 210), to Léontine Zanta, Teilhard wrote, “As you already know, what dominates my interest and my pre-occupations is the effort to establish in myself and to spread around a new religion (you may call it a better Christianity) in which the personal God ceases to be the great neolithic proprietor of former times, in order to become the soul of the world; our religious and cultural stage calls for this”.

For Teilhard the new religion “is burgeoning in the heart of modern man, from a seed sown by the idea of evolution”. (*Activation of Energy* by Teilhard de Chardin, p. 383). As Wolfgang Smith remarks, this new religion “has sprung not out of Christianity, but out of a scientific hypothesis. . . It appears in fact that the true founder of the new cult is not Yaweh or Christ, but Charles Darwin”. (p. 210).

The Author leads us through the Teilhardian world governed by the law of Complexity/Consciousness, where souls evolve out of the primordial “stuff of the universe” (p. 52), in a cosmos which is physically converging towards an Omega Point, where the Ascended Christ is “raised to the position of Prime Mover of the evolutive movement of complexity consciousness” (*The Heart of Matter* by Teilhard de Chardin, p. 94), as if Christ was not the Prime Mover from the start. When all is said and done, however, Teilhard’s need to trade old doctrine for new in the name of a scientific hypothesis, should have been enough to warn the theologians that evolution was contrary to the truth; that when truth goes out of the window, the Devil comes through the door. Clearly this is what happened.

Once the new religion was installed and the evolution rationale for dismissing Adam as the ancestor of mankind

was accepted, Eve, Original Sin and all the allied doctrines were drained of their doctrinal meaning. Teilhard's key role was soon forgotten and even the suggestion that evolutionary theory underpinned the New Church was dismissed as irrelevant. There was, however, an uncomfortable feeling amongst many, at least to start with, that the element of "spirituality" was missing. By and large that awareness has faded. Yet spirituality is the time-honoured arrow which points to "the Way, the Truth and the Life". It is a sign immediately recognisable by those whose child-like awe of the Almighty is untroubled by the more "mature" approach. "Truly, I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the Kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18-3). The New Religion can in fact be identified by its absence of spirituality. It used to be said that a Catholic entering a Protestant church felt it was empty in some way. It was believed that this was due to the absence of the Real Presence in the form of the Blessed Sacrament. This must be true to the extent that spirituality stems from belief in the presence of Christ in the tabernacle. Such belief is accompanied by an innate sense of the reverence due from us in the presence of the One who holds our lives, our universe and our eternity in His hands, "Upholding all things by the word of his power" (Hebrews 1-3). As Christ fell on his knees to pray to the Father, so we imitate him when we are in his house. If there is a need to speak in church, it is in hushed whispers. Any distraction is felt as a slight to the Almighty, simply because all human activity on hallowed ground should logically be directed towards His honour and glory. Where spirituality is missing, the New Religion is normally present. It can be discerned in the church by such things as the Blessed Sacrament not being in a central position, kneelers having been removed, private conversations being held irrespective of the sacred Presence, recorded music, particularly vocal music "to provide an atmosphere which" invariably distracts from prayer, rehearsals of services, lessons in catechetics, conducted tours, anything in fact which detracts from an intimate communion with the Person in whose House we are invited to pray.

The phenomenon of the New Religion superimposing itself upon the Catholic religion has been confused with

"renewal". Dr. Wolfgang Smith dispels such ideas by his powerful analysis of the teachings of Fr. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. His book not only draws our attention to the dramatic situation in which the Church finds itself, but shows how belief in the false god of evolution has given rise to it.

It seems almost trivial to offer any criticism to this exemplary work, however there is one area which perhaps reveals a weakness. This is the author's apparent acceptance that the Earth is very old and that it probably began according to the current cosmological theory of "the big bang". Here, somewhat ironically, he seems to have fallen into the evolutionist trap. As more and more anomalies are appearing regarding this theory, particularly with regard to the source of the background radiation upon which it is based and the doubt by some astro-physicists that the universe is, in fact expanding, it is worth examining why the theory was at first put forward. The fact is that until the evolution theory was advanced it was never thought necessary to look for a hypothesis which would give a long age to the Earth rather than the short age of a few thousand years suggested by Genesis. All the fossils found in the rocks were accepted as having been the result of the mass extinction of life at the time of the Great Flood. Evolution, however, demanded thousands of millions of years to carry out the incredible transformations it proposed, and theories were posited to provide all that time. It is only in very recent years that evidence has been compiled to show that methods of dating rocks and the very principles of rock formation are based on very shaky assumptions. In fact, recent experiments published by the French Academy of Science provide empirical evidence that the formation of laminations and rock strata are a physical phenomena unlinked with time. In other words sedimentary rocks could have been formed rapidly over a short period of time and the fossils in them the result of mass extinction by drowning and suffocation by mud. The Great Flood, dismissed by evolution theory as myth, is beginning to look like a more logical explanation of the mile thick fossil graveyard which encircles the earth.

*Peter Wilders*